TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES BOARD MEETING

Friday, November 13, 2015

Lone Star Room
Building 1
4000 Jackson Avenue
Austin, Texas

BOARD MEMBERS:

Laura Ryan, Chair
Robert "Barney" Barnwell, III
Luanne Caraway
Blake Ingram
Raymond Palacios
Marvin Rush
Gary Swindle
Memo Treviño
Johnny Walker

I N D E X

<u>AGENI</u>	DA ITI	<u> EM</u>			PAGE
1.	CALL A.	TO OF		and Establishment of Quorum	6
	В.	Publi	Lc Cor	nment	7
	С.		d Memk Chaiı	and Announcements from Chair, bers, and Executive Director Reports	
			a.	Recognition of Service - Board Members Rodriguez and Slovacek	11
			b.	Committee Member Appointments	21
			С.	Proposed 2016 Board Meeting Schedule	22
		2.	Execua.	utive Director Reports Awards/Announcements	22
			b.	Household Goods Rules Advisory Committee Update	23
			C.	Quarterly Performance Measures	24
			d.	Operational Plan	29
2.	EXECUA. B. C.	Secti	ion 55 ion 55	ION 10 51.071 51.074 51.076	& 133
3.	ACTICA.	Deale Modif Agree of Re Secti 14-00 LIC, Truck	er's Prication of the second considerate of the second considerate of the second constant o	CONTESTED CASES rotest Against Manufacturer's ion of the Franchise with Regard to the Dealer's Area sibility under Occupations Code, 2301.454 and 2301.45 IC - SOAH Docket No. 608-14-1068 ten Truck Center, L.C. v. Volvo th America, a Division of Volvo th America, LLC	30
	В.	Occup 13-00 LIC,	oation 008 LI Budge	of Ownership by Dealer Under ns Code, Section 2301.359 IC - SOAH Docket No. 608-13-4599 et Leasing, Inc. d/b/a Audi North d Audi South Austin and Ricardo M	

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Weitz, Hi Tech Imports North, LLC, Hi Tech Imports South, LLC, Hi Tech Imports, LLC v. Volkswagen Group of Am., Inc. and Porsche Cars North America (NOT HEARD/SETTLED)

4.	ACTION A.		EMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION lement Authority (TABLED)	
	В.	Execu	ative Director Compensation	133
5.	REPOR A.	Finar	nce & Audit Quarterly Financial Report	89
		2.	 Internal Audit Division Status a. Internal Audit Division Status Report - November 2015 b. Audit of TxDMV's Administration of Statutes and Rules through Tax Assessor-Collectors, TxDMV 15-4 c. Annual Internal Audit Report for FY 2015, TxDMV 16-1 	99
	В.	Legis	slative Implementation	104
	С.	Enter	rprise Projects Quarterly Report	113
6.	POSSI	IBLE A	, DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION -Chair Election	134
	В.	Conti	racts Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Annual Maintenance Renewal	137
		2.	Single Sticker Phase II Programming for Texas International Registration Plan (TxIRP)	138
		3.	TxDMV-TxDOT Technology Separation	141
		4.	Revised Resolution from August 14, 2015 Meeting; Contracts Reflected in the 2016 Operating Budget	143
	С.		inuation of Motor Vehicle License sory Committee	145
	D.		ialty Plate Design Southern Miss (Vendor Plate)	148

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Ε.			sic Black (Vendor Plate) EMS - RULES	149
2.	1.	Adopt	tion of Rules under Title 43, s Administrative Code Chapter 206, Management Section 206.41, Petition	150
		b.	Chapter 208, Employment Practices Section 208.12, General Standards (concerning tuition reimbursement)	
		С.	Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle Distribution Rule Review, Government Code, §2001.039 Repeals/Amendments	153
		d.	New Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers, Salvage Pool Operators and Salvage Vehicle Rebuilders New Subchapters A - F, Sections 221.1 - 221.115 Repeal Chapter 217 Subchapter I, Salvage Vehicle Dealers	162
		е.	Chapter 219, Oversize and Overweight Vehicles and Loads Subchapters A - E, G and H	164
		f.	Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration Section 217.56, Registration Reciprocity Agreements	167
	2.		osal of Rules under Title 43, s Administrative Code Chapter 206, Management	169
			Section 206.93, Advisory Committee Operations New Section 206.94, Household Good Rules Advisory Committee New Section 206.95, Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee	
		b.	Chapter 210, Contract Management New Section 210.3, Enhanced Contract Monitoring Program	176
		С.	Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration	178
ADJOU	JRNMEI	NT		180

7.

PROCEEDINGS

MS. RYAN: Good morning, everyone. My name is Laura Ryan, and I am pleased to open the Board meeting of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. It is 8:04 a.m., and I am now calling the Board meeting for November 13, 2015 to order. I want to note for the record that the public notice of this meeting, containing all items on the agenda, was filed with the Office of Secretary of State on November 4, 2015.

Before we begin today's meeting, please place all cell phones and other communication devices in a silent mode.

If you wish to address the board during today's meeting, please complete a speaker's sheet on the registration table. To comment on an agenda item, please complete a yellow sheet and identify the agenda item. If it is not an agenda item, we will take your comments during the public comment portion of this meeting.

On September 2, 2015, Governor Abbott appointed Gary M. Swindle of Tyler to replace Victor Rodriguez, and Guillermo Memo Treviño of Laredo to replace Joe Slovacek, whose terms have expired. Mr. Swindle is the board's new law enforcement member, and Mr. Treviño is the board's new public representative. The new members have fulfilled their requirements of training and have been duly sworn in

1	to the office.
2	And now I'd like to take a roll call of the
3	board members. Board Member Barnwell?
4	MR. BARNWELL: Present.
5	MS. RYAN: Board Member Caraway?
6	MS. CARAWAY: Present.
7	MS. RYAN: Board Member Ingram?
8	MR. INGRAM: Present.
9	MS. RYAN: Board Member Palacios?
10	MR. PALACIOS: Here.
11	MS. RYAN: Board Member Rush?
12	MR. RUSH: Here.
13	MS. RYAN: Board Member Swindle?
14	MR. SWINDLE: Here.
15	MS. RYAN: Board Member Treviño?
16	MR. TREVIÑO: Here.
17	MS. RYAN: Board Member Walker?
18	MR. WALKER: Here.
19	MS. RYAN: And let the record reflect that I,
20	Laura Ryan, am here also. We have a quorum. It's been a
21	long time. We have no members absent.
22	I see we have a comment sheet from the public
23	so we'll now hear comments before we got into
24	announcements on 1.C. Mr. Hickman, are you present?
25	Thank you.

1	MR. DUNCAN: While Mr. Hickman is getting
2	situated, I'd like to read the standard statement on
3	public comment again. Under the Texas Open Meetings Act,
4	the board can't comment or deliberate on public comment
5	unless it relates to an item posted on the agenda. This
6	is because the public would not have been on notice that
7	the board might discuss that subject. If the board so
8	desires, we can schedule some aspect of the commenters'
9	comments for a future agenda with the approval of the
10	chairman. Pursuant to Board Rule 34, Texas Administrative
11	Code 206.22(b)(3), open public comment is limited to three
12	minutes per presenter. We have a timer which will go to a
13	yellow light when the commenter has one minute remaining
14	and a red light when their time is up.
15	MS. RYAN: Mr. Hickman, we'll start the timer.
16	MR. HICKMAN: The timer is over there, though.
17	I can't see it.
18	MS. RYAN: Okay. We'll move it for you. Can
19	vou see it now?

you see it now?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. For the record, my name is Howard Anthony Hickman. I'm a retired enforcement attorney for this agency.

After the last board meeting, I reviewed TxDMV's quarterly performance measures. My initial thought was just how much taxpayer money was wasted on a system that 27 percent of the performance measures were zero equivalents yet the agency received a passing score. It brought to mind the old axiom: Figures lie and liars figure.

1.5

2.5

In looking at government production statistics,

I'm always reminded of a story an old boss of mine used to

tell about the manager of a Soviet shoe factor who

determined that he could double shoe production by making
only pairs of size four left shoes. So he implemented the
change and doubled the factory production. The Soviet

Politburo was so impressed with the increased production
that it made the factory manager the regional manager for
shoe production. He then implemented the manufacture of
only pairs of size four left shoes in all the factories in
the region and again doubled shoe production. The

Politburo was so impressed that it made him the first

People's Commissar of Soviet Shoe Production and awarded
him the Order of Lenin.

That story illustrates the problems with government performance statistics: they're bigger in production numbers but lacking in product quality and product utility. The last report of the Enforcement Division classically only production numbers but totally lacks any measures of product quality or product utility. To achieve the division's merit production quotas, motor

vehicle investigators are allocated six and two-thirds hours of investigation time per case and attorneys are allocated two hours and thirteen minutes of attorney time. The result is that no complicated investigations occur, and as I mentioned in last lecture, only paperwork and technical violations are prosecuted. I know of cases where the Federal Trade Commission assessed and \$8 million fine on one set dealers and another Texas dealer was facing \$16,000 a day FTC fine. In neither case did this agency pursue an investigation.

2.5

Let me give you a quick performance measure to gauge the Enforcement Division's product quality and product utility. From the news coverage you should know that Volkswagen has defrauded 32,000 Texans with substandard diesel engines for six model years. Under TxDMV civil penalty guidelines, each count of fraud carries a minimum penalty of \$1,000. Thirty-two thousand times \$1,000 is \$32 million. Just check and see if the Enforcement Division has issued a notice of violation to Volkswagen assessing at least a \$32 million fine. If they have not, do not ask why not because there is no good excuse for such failure, but rather ask why does the Enforcement Division continue to manufacture only pairs of size four left shoes.

It is time the TxDMV regulation of the special

interest, by the special interest and for the special interest ends. Texas expects you to do your duty.

And since I have lots of time left, let me say have a happy Friday the 13th, and unlike the HMS Friday the 13th that was launched on Friday the 13th, made its maiden voyage on Friday the 13th and was never seen again, you will see me at the next board meeting. Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Thank you, Mr. Hickman.

We're going to at this point change the agenda slightly and go into a very brief executive session to prepare for some of the future agenda items. We don't plan to be in long so don't go far. We are going to go into a closed session. It is now 8:11 a.m. on November 13. We will go into closed session under Texas Code Section 551.071. For those of you in the audience, I anticipate being in executive session for approximately fifteen minutes and we will reconvene in open session after that. With that, we are recessed from the public meeting and we are going into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 8:11 a.m., the meeting was recessed, to reconvene this same day, Friday, November 13, 2015, following conclusion of the executive session.)

MS. RYAN: It's approximately 8:45 a.m. on November 13, and the Board of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles is now in open session. I want to note

that no action was taken in closed session.

We're going to go back to our agenda and we are now on item 1.C.1, recognition of service. We've got, as I mentioned earlier, some transition and as I mentioned, we've got a couple of new board members, but I also wanted to take a few minutes and recognize the two board members that are leaving us after one lots of years and one several years. And I see Joe.

MR. WALKER: Where is Victor? Is he here?

MS. RYAN: He's hiding, he's over there with

Joe.

We did get one of them here only at the promise not to have a parade. So we promised not to have a parade, so for those of you that are disappointed.

(General laughter.)

MS. RYAN: I did want to take a few minutes and recognize our two incoming board members, so welcome Gary and Memo, and our outgoing board members. And we're pleased to have you both on the board of the DMV and the DMV team. Serving on this board I think you'll find is a truly rewarding experience. You'll find that you're able to be a part of positive change for the both industries we serve and represent and the citizens of the state in which we live. In addition, and it's my opinion, you'll find that it represents an active definition of servant

leadership.

Since the inception of this agency, the leadership team and the board have worked together to establish a culture and an environment that creates a vision and inspires our employees to embrace the strategy and the values and the goals of the Texas DMV. We've committed and continued our focus on being customercentric, performance-driven and to optimize the efficiencies that drive for innovation, all of which are supported by the common characteristic that everyone on this board and in the agency has, and that is to serve.

To that end, I'd like to take a minute and thank both Victor Rodriguez and Joe Slovacek for their service, time, leadership and their efforts to assist in setting up the vision strategy and for putting the governance policies in place for this agency, and without their dedication, time and support, we wouldn't be where we're at today.

Victor was appointed in September 2009 and has served on this board for a little over six years. Victor was one of the original appointees on the board and helped establish the solid foundation that is in place today. Victor has provided wise counsel and always made himself available to assist when needed, often making multiple trips to Austin to participate in committees or working

groups in between meetings and board meetings, and he's always helped us stay on track. Many of us have joked that we're not really going to know when noon is anymore now that he does not sit on the board.

Over the past five years Victor has often been a voice of reason and has truly become a personal and respected friend. For both your service to the Texas DMV and the State of Texas, as well as your friendship, I personally thank you.

Joe was appointed in May of 2013 and has served on the board for the past two and half years. Joe has provided direction and wise guidance to the board and served as chair of the Legislative and Public Affairs Committee. Joe has also provided a unique and direct approach to the needs of this agency. Also, we have been able to work together through the unique challenges of this agency and face the goals of the agency and strive to reach for common results and through all of this we have developed a mutual respect and friendship for each other as well, and for your service to the DMV and the State of Texas, I also personally thank you.

So on behalf of the agency and the board members, I want to let you know how grateful we all are for your service, both of you, for your time and attention to this agency, and I am personally thankful to have had

I and the agency do have something for you, but before we present that, I know Whitney and Johnny have something they want to say also.

MR. WALKER: First off, get up here to the front of the room. We can't even see you hiding behind a post back there.

(General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: I'll tell you what, Victor, I didn't know you before I got on the DMV Board up here, and I'll never forget as we started this thing and all the experiences that we went through from the first days and what we were supposed to do and how we were going to do it, and I kind of just sat back and I was kind of shy to be around a police chief. I didn't know whether to be concerned about whether I had an outstanding ticket.

MS. RYAN: Did he just say he was shy? (General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: Well, I was around Victor because I always have probably an outstanding ticket I didn't know about and I was worried.

Over the years I've really learned to respect you and your character and the things that you bestow upon yourself, and you've always been cordial to me, you've invited me to say hey, come on down to my home any time

you're in the area down there, and I really appreciate that. And I learned to respect your opinion. I know you have a lot of knowledge about state government, you've been around it a long time, and every time I was kind of hesitant about what I should do, I kind of looked back to you as a mentor to help me out and I appreciate all that you did for me.

Joe, I've known you not through the DMV Board but it goes all the way back to Joe and I -- I've never told anybody this before, but Joe and I live right around the corner from each other, and I met Joe, and I know you're going to say lightning is going to strike the building probably, but I know Joe through Sunday School class.

(General laughter.)

MR. WALKER: Joe and I were in Sunday School class for years together and I got to know he and his wife, Pam, quite well. But I know where you're coming from, I know your characteristics from years of experience in the neighborhood, and his kids went to school with my kids, and so forth. I've enjoyed working for the last year and a half with you, and I really appreciate it. And I know I'll be seeing you around the neighborhood. His brother-in-law lives right across the street from me. But I've really enjoyed it.

Thanks, guys, and you're always welcome to come back and straighten us out when we need to be straightened out.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: If I may, Mr. Chairman. Do you want to start the clock?

(General laughter.)

MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's been a privilege, it's always a privilege to be able to serve Texas, and it's an honor to serve Texas. When we serve in this capacity, the paycheck is not very big, as you know, but there is a reward, and the reward is being able to gain friends and to work with people that you can later call board colleagues. And there's also the reward of working with what I call one of the best state staffs in Texas at DMV, and that's my reward as I leave today. I've been able to meet outstanding Texans, like yourselves on the board, and I think we have the most outstanding state employees at DMV, currently led by Whitney Brewster.

And Whitney, it's been a privilege to meet you throughout the process to bring you to Texas again. And was and I am today very proud of all the staff. The staff here does an outstanding piece of work each and every time.

So for all of those things it's been a honor, and the reward is highly valued by me. So thank you very

1.5

MR. SLOVACEK: Victor, thank you for your seven years of service. That's above and beyond the call of duty.

And I would tell each of you folks thank you for your service. Thank you for everything you do for the State of Texas. Thank you for your friendship. I do consider you friends. I appreciate the notes that I've received. I knew I was filling a two-year unexpired term. I enjoyed my two years and I really appreciate all of the benefits and personal relationships that I've developed while I was here, wonderful staff. Thank you very much. Thank you for the gifts, but I'm going to have to return those size four left foot shoes because I'm a size twelve and they won't work. Other than that, thank you very much.

(General laughter and applause.)

MS. RYAN: Please don't leave. Don't go anywhere.

(Pause for presentations and photographs.)

MS. RYAN: Hold on one second, Joe and Victor. Victor, it's not noon yet, don't leave. Joe and Victor, f you can hang with us one more second, Whitney has a few

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

things she'd like to say.

MS. BREWSTER: On behalf of all the staff of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles, I want to express our heartfelt gratitude to you, Chief Rodriguez, and to you, Joe Slovacek.

Chief Rodriguez, as an original board member of the TxDMV, you've seen this agency through a great transition. It has been a great commitment on your part, and this department and the state is indebted to you. Your perspective on issues has enriched the debate on topics of importance to this agency and the state. I will be forever grateful to you not only for your contribution to the growth and support of this agency over the years, but of me as its executive director. You have helped me better understand my role and helped me grow more fully into the position that I hold, and I will be forever grateful to you for that. You will be greatly missed.

Mr. Slovacek, I am grateful to you for the trust that you have placed in the staff at this agency. You have consistently supported the staff in what it needs to conduct business, whether it's been facilitating meetings with decision-makers on agency priorities or trying to understand from the staff's perspective the impact of board decisions. It is clear that you care about the perspective and impact on the employees of this

agency and I am grateful to you for that. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

2.5

MS. RYAN: Thank you, everyone, for allowing us time for this transition. As you can see, everyone on this board is grateful for the board members and the time on this transition.

We have one last recognition that we'd like to take a minute and recognize, and Johnny, I wanted to take a minute on behalf of the agency leadership and the rest of the board and acknowledge our transition. You've also served this agency and the board since its inception when you were appointed in 2009 and have also provided insight and leadership and have been a large part of setting the vision and the strategy and helped put the governance policies in place for this agency, and this has allowed for the strong foundation that this agency can continue to build on for years to come.

For the past two and a half years you have led the Texas DMV as chairman of this agency and the leadership has been in great hands. We have also made a great team and I look forward to a continued strong working relationship as we move into the next chapter of this agency's future.

As a token of appreciation for your time and

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

dedication and attention to this board and agency, I would like to present the token of our appreciation of the agency staff and the board and myself in sincere appreciation and thank you for your service as chairman of the Board of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Laura.

(Applause.)

MR. WALKER: Well, I know that the agency is in good hands and I've worked with you very closely for the last six years, five years, and I know that -- and I'm not being disrespectful to anybody else on the board, but I know that Laura has taken a very strong interest in management of the department, she has put a lot of work into it, hard work into it, and she is very deserving of the position that she has. And I'm not going anywhere any time soon. I will be her to offer my support always and help her in any way I can to benefit the agency going forward. Thank you.

MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: What did I do now?

(General laughter.)

MS. BREWSTER: This goes without saying, you have a larger than life personality, but also the heart to match. I am grateful for your common sense and leadership on issues. Your sacrifice of time and energy over the

course of your time as chair is commendable, and I am truly grateful for the strong working relationship that we have developed during that time. Thank you for your support of the agency, and we look forward to your continued leadership on the board. Thank you very much.

MS. RYAN: Thanks, everyone, for your time and attention and patience with us.

MR. WALKER: Now let's get down to business.

MS. RYAN: Get down to business.

Victor, Joe, thank you again for your time.

And Victor, there's a parade out there so you might want
to put your flashers on as you leave Austin.

(General laughter.)

MS. RYAN: We'd like to 1.B, committee member appointments. We just quickly want to review the list.

We just really wanted to make everybody aware of the revised committee members. The board members currently are aware of them. Our Finance and Audit Committee will be chaired by Raymond Palacios; members will include Luanne Caraway, Marvin Rush, Gary Swindle. Our Projects and Operations Committee will be chaired by Blake Ingram; members will include Barney Barnwell, Gary Swindle, Johnny Walker. And our Legislative and Public Affairs Committee will be chaired by Blake Ingram, Barney Barnwell, Luanne Caraway and Memo Treviño. Committee meetings will be held

1 on an as needed basis, as we've always had. We'll also continue on to item 1.C. 2 We've 3 posted our proposed board meeting schedule which is also 4 in your books, just mainly to keep everyone aware. 5 see that with the exception of January and October, the 6 meetings are currently on Thursdays, the first Thursday of 7 every month. January, I think it's on Friday and I think in October it's on a later date but still on a Thursday. 8 9 So mainly just for awareness. With that, we'll move to item 2, executive 10 11 director reports, and I'll turn it over to Whitney. 12 MS. BREWSTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. 13 I want to recognize a man that really needs no 14 introduction. Our own Bill Harbeson has hit a milestone 15 in his career with the state. I want to thank Bill for 16 his fifteen years of service with the State of Texas. 17 (Applause.) 18 MS. BREWSTER: I am grateful for his 19 contribution to this agency. He adds levity to what we do 20 and always tries to do the right thing for our customers 21 and stakeholders. And I want to thank you very much, 22 Bill. 23 May I move on, Madam Chair?

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. BREWSTER: At its August meeting the board

Absolutely.

MS. RYAN:

24

2.5

approved the creation of the Household Goods Rules

Advisory Committee. If you will recall, the board

delegated the authority to me as the executive director to

finalize the membership of that committee which I have

done. Just a reminder, the committee is authorized by the

Transportation Code as a means to facilitate review of the

rules affecting this industry. The committee may make

recommendations to the board about proposed rule changes.

On November 10 the committee held its initial meeting right here at TxDMV headquarters. Serving on the committee are: Jim French of Scobey Moving and Storage, who was elected as chairman of the committee; Chris Moucka of IMS Relocation; Conrad Gwaltney of Allied North American Van Lines; Steve Lancashire of American Relocation and Storage, Inc.; Tracy McCullough of WestStar Moving and Storage, Inc.; and the three public members: Carrie Hurt from the Better Business Bureau, Mark Weiss from the University of Texas at Austin; and Jason Badder, Commercial Vehicle Enforcement for the Williamson County Sheriff's Office. The two members from the TxDMV staff are: Bill Harbeson, our Enforcement director; and Carol Fallin, Motor Carrier Household Goods chief investigator.

After hearing testimony from the industry, the public and staff, the committee made twelve recommendations for changes to the rules, and these

recommendations surrounded three key areas: the first being conditional acceptance of applications for registration, the second being claim for damages to household goods shipments, and finally, tariff filings.

Staff will now draft rules to propose. Those rules will be submitted to the advisory committee for their review and comments, followed by proposal to this board by the committee, and it is the committee's ultimate goal to present a recommended rule revision to the board for consideration and approval.

And the general consensus from the meeting was that all in attendance felt that the process was very beneficial. With that, I have no other comments on that agenda item.

If I may, I'll move to the next item, Madam Chair, performance measures. In your board packets you will find the dashboard of the agency's performance measures.

For our new board members, the agency reports quarterly at the board meetings on its progress on these key performance indicators. Our performance measures are broken out by three strategic goals set by the board: the first being that the agency be performance driven; the next optimizing services and innovation; and finally, that the agency is customer-centric.

Terri Tuttle has refined the dashboard to make it clearer based on some of the feedback she received from you all. Of course, if there are other things that you would like to see reported, please don't hesitate to let either of us know.

2.5

There are fifty-three different measures that roll up to an overall score for each of the goals, and that's what you see in the dashboard, and I'm happy to provide you with that information on those specific measures if anyone would like to see a more drilled down view of where these scores come from. And in fact, in light of Mr. Hickman's comments, I will, following this meeting, send all of those performance measures out to you for your review.

The agency has set targets for each of those goals and please note that these targets were intentionally set high to allow the agency to stretch towards those goals. Today I am reporting to you the agency's third quarter measures for 2015. In general, where we saw the biggest decline in the overall score this quarter comes in our area of optimized performance and innovation. And the primary drivers of the decline in this measure are in two key areas of the agency, the first being in the agency's enterprise-wide projects.

As most of you know, the agency has about

twenty large scale enterprise-wide projects. We have done a very good job of staying within budget to complete those projects, however, we have struggled with completing some of our projects on time. And you all should be aware that this is not due to a lack of initiative across this agency, what this is a reflection of is resources. Many of the same resources are needed across the enterprise projects, and therefore, we are continuously having to be flexible when it comes to the availability of those key resources. The governance team, comprised of all division directors and various advisors, continuously look at the resource plan and make adjustments to help align resources to get the work done.

RTS refactoring has required significantly more resources than originally anticipated, and therefore, has eaten up many key resources, particularly as we've moved through the county deployments for point of sale and now the cut-over off of the main frame that is occurring on November 20.

Another area that the agency needs to improve upon that led to the dip in this quarter is the timeliness in which we complete performance evaluations of employees in this agency. Again, I believe that this is reflection of time, or lack thereof, and frankly, this activity has taken a backseat to many of the other activities this

agency has going on. Timely feedback and goal setting is important for all employees, we recognize that, and I know we can do better, and we will -- myself included.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

An area that you might be interested in where we've seen improvement is in the area of online registration renewal. I think it has reached the highest level that I've seen in the three years that I've been here, and we have a long way to go in driving more people to do transactions online, however, we've reached 19 percent of our renewals being completed online. I know that this number will only get better. VTR, the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division, coupled with efforts by the Government and Strategic Communications Division, have really started to push the use of eReminder, the electronic noticing program that the agency has for renewing registration, and I think maybe in front of you some of you have the pin that looks like this. This is being sent out to customers across the state. actually scanable, you can scan this and sign up. It will immediately take you to the online application for eReminder.

So I just wanted to let the board know that, yes, there are areas that have taken a dip this quarter but there are also very positive things that are continuing to occur to the agency and contributing to the

1 success of the agency. With that, Madam Chair, I'm happy to answer any 2 3 questions that the board has. 4 MR. INGRAM: Ms. Brewster, I have one question. 5 On the 19 percent on the online renewals, can you give me 6 sort of a baseline of where we were perhaps a year ago so 7 that I understand what the increase is? MS. BREWSTER: Yes, Member Ingram. 8 9 first arrived in 2012, I believe that the online was about 10 12 percent, and last year it was around 15 percent, and 11 now we've moved up to 19 percent. And we are going to 12 really continue to make a concerted effort to drive more 13 of our customers to the most convenient way of doing a 14 transaction which is online from the comfort of their 15 homes. 16 MR. INGRAM: Do we have a specific goal that 17 we're shooting for on the online renewals? One hundred? MS. BREWSTER: One hundred would be fantastic. 18 19 (General laughter.) 20 MR. INGRAM: That's optimistic. I like that. MS. BREWSTER: That's very optimistic. 21 22 original goal for this fiscal year was 20 percent, and I think that that's achievable. 23 24 MR. INGRAM: Thank you very much.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. BREWSTER: And Madam Chair, if there aren't

2.5

any other questions, if I could move into the final item.

MS. RYAN: Any other questions? No.

MS. BREWSTER: The agency has worked hard to finalize its operational plans. We went through this effort to chart the course of operational activities for the year to come based on the strategic plan and goals set out by the department, and in particular this board, to also coordinate our resources needed to accomplish initiatives in the year to come and to ensure that all employees have a better understanding of what and why we are doing the things that we do within this agency.

For our new board members, this is not an activity required by statute or requested by the board, this is something that the executive team of this agency initiated to make sure that we get the things done that we need to get done, despite the unanticipated things that continually pop up that take time. We have provided you with a copy of the operational plan, should you desire to have one. This information is on the agency's intranet site and the division directors provide ongoing updates on their division initiatives at executive team meetings, as well as one-on-one meetings that Shelly Mellott and I have with each of the division directors. As initiatives are completed, we will continue to update the board on the agency's progress.

With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

MS. RYAN: Any questions?

(No response.)

2.5

3.A.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.

MS. RYAN: So with that, we will move to item

Good morning.

MR. AVITIA: Good morning. Madam Chair, board members, Ms. Brewster, good morning. For the record, my name is Daniel Avitia. I have the pleasure of serving as the director of the Motor Vehicle Division. Alongside me this morning is Ms. Michelle Lingo, staff attorney with the Motor Vehicle Division. Ms. Lingo is the attorney and legal subject matter expert that was assigned to review this specific case.

Agenda item 3.A is being presented for the board's consideration to adopt a final order. This case involves Sweeten Truck protested the franchise agreement modifications proposed by Volvo Trucks to reduce Sweeten's area of responsibility from twenty-four Texas counties to fourteen Texas counties. The issue presented in this case is whether Volvo Trucks established, by a preponderance of the evidence, good cause for the proposed franchise

modification.

The SOAH administrative law judge in this case found that the evidence introduced into the record by Volvo Trucks establishes that good cause and supports granting the franchise modifications proposed by Volvo Trucks, and the ALJ recommends that the board approve the franchise modifications proposed by Volvo Trucks to reduce Sweeten Truck's area of responsibility, as stated in the proposal for decision, from twenty-four to fourteen counties.

established to modify the franchise, the law requires that the board consider all existing circumstances, including seven specific factors. Those seven factors are: one, the dealer's sales in relation to the sales market; two, the dealer's investment and obligations; three, injury or benefit to the public; four, the adequacy of the dealer's service facilities, equipment, parts and personnel in relation to those of other dealers of new motor vehicles of the same line make; five, whether warranties are being honored by the dealer; six, the party's compliance with the franchise; and seven, the enforceability of the franchise from a public policy standpoint.

Now, in issuing the PFD, the ALJ found that good cause was established by the evidence presented in

factors one, two and four. In factors three, five, six and seven, the ALJ held that a lack of evidence and/or argument presented by the parties as to each of the four factors resulted in each constituting neutral factors, and thus, not an existing circumstance that affects the good cause analysis.

That being said, today the SOAH ALJ's proposal for decision, Sweeten's exceptions to the PFD, and Volvo Trucks' reply to Sweeten's exceptions are before you for your consideration. Texas Government Code Section 2001.058(e) allows an agency to modify an order issued by a SOAH ALJ only if the ALJ misapplied or misinterpreted the law, relied on a prior agency decision that is incorrect or should be changed, or made a technical error in a finding of fact. After staff's review of all the documents that are before this board today, the Motor Vehicle Division recommends that the board issue an order that adopts the ALJ's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law as modified.

Staff believes the ALJ's analysis of the law and the evidence presented is thorough and that the conclusions reached in this case are reasonable. Staff has prepared a final order for your consideration which, again, aligns with the SOAH ALJ's recommendation to the board to determine that there is good cause for the Volvo

Trucks proposed modification to Sweeten Truck's franchise.

Ms. Lingo and I are happy to answer any questions you may have.

MR. PALACIOS: I do have a question. This is a question regarding the summary here of staff concerns regarding the PFD from the ALJ. It states: The ALJ did not provide all the required findings and conclusions. For the board's consideration, the final draft order adds findings of fact and conclusions of law.

I guess my question is, first off, why did staff come in and, I guess, fill in the gaps, if you will, for the ALJ, and what specifically were those findings and conclusions of law that staff filled in?

MS. LINGO: Good morning. Michelle Lingo for the record.

Member Palacios, that's a very good question.

One of the responsibilities of the Motor Vehicle Division is to evaluate the PFD, the findings of fact and conclusions of laws, and see that everything aligns with the law and the requirements. Occupations Code 2301.711 requires that there be a finding of fact on each of the seven factors, and because the ALJ didn't complete each of those, what I did was to make sure that for each of the factors that you are required to consider as the board that you have a finding of fact for each of those. So

what I did is make sure that the order that's before you comports with the requirements of the law, and that's my job, that's my responsibility to make sure that that happens.

MR. PALACIOS: Okay. So it's staff's responsibility to fill in the voids and gaps that the ALJ may miss. That's what I'm understanding?

MS. LINGO: Yes, sir. Under the Occupations
Code 2001.058(e), there are certain parameters where the
ALJ's decision, including the findings of fact and
conclusions of law that the ALJ prepared, have to be
evaluated, and there's limitations on how and when we can
modify those, so within the parameters of 2001.058(e), we
made recommendations to add findings of fact and
conclusions of law that will then make the order that's
before you comport with the law.

MR. DUNCAN: And if I may, Mr. Palacios. David Duncan, general counsel.

It's not that there was nothing in the ALJ's

PFD discussion about the factors. The ALJ did have

discussion of the factors, just didn't in that bottom part

of the PFD in the findings and conclusions actually write.

It's not that the staff invented evidence or added

anything to the record, we used the record to create these

findings and conclusions.

1 MR. PALACIOS: Thank you. MR. AVITIA: Board members, I also failed to 2 3 mention, and I do apologize, the screen before you is the state representation. The dark outlined counties indicate 4 the current area of responsibility, the shaded in red 5 6 outline the proposed modification and the removal of those 7 counties. 8 MS. RYAN: Thank you. That's helpful. 9 Any other questions before we take the 10 comments? 11 (No response.) 12 MS. RYAN: Okay. We do have public comment. 13 We have two public comment cards on this particular agenda 14 item. We'll take them in order with Volvo first. We'd 15 like to call Keith Russell on this agenda item, 16 representing this Volvo. 17 David, I think it's been discussed fifteen minutes? 18 19 MR. DUNCAN: Fifteen minutes per party. Yes, 20 ma'am. 21 MS. RYAN: Per party. And I think it's been 22 addressed that if you'd like to reserve some of that for 23 rebuttal, we'll certainly keep it in mind. We do 24 understand how important these matters are, so if you can

reserve some of that, that will be great, although we'll

25

consider the questions that the board may ask and take that into consideration.

So Mr. Russell, we'll turn the time over to you.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Keith Russell, and I represent Volvo Trucks. Here with me today for Volvo Trucks is Mr. Scott Finley. Scott is in charge of the dealer network and is based in Greensboro, North Carolina.

In this case, as you've heard, Volvo Trucks seeks to modify Sweeten's area of responsibility, as it is expressly permitted to do under the statute upon a showing of good cause. And here the administrative law judge found that we did show good cause, and the ALJ is correct, the staff did a good job of reviewing the record and preparing its recommendation which is to adopt the ALJ's PFD with minor revisions that neither party objected to. There is no basis under the Government Code 2001.058(e) for the board to change or modify or vacate the PFD in this case.

Turning to the facts of this case -- and I have just a very few boards to show you -- so Sweeten's assigned area is the orange shading on this map, and as you can see, it's an enormous geographic area that Sweeten has in Texas. However, Sweeten has failed to adequately

represent Volvo Trucks in that market. After carefully studying Sweeten's performance in the market, Volvo Trucks determined that it would take this action to modify Sweeten's territory so that the territory assigned to it reflected what Sweeten was actually doing, where it was actually making sales. As a result, Volvo Trucks sent Sweeten a notice on September 23, 2013 that it intended to modify its area of responsibility.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

I'll show you one more board that's a zoomed in look at Sweeten's assigned territory. Now, on the map in front of you, the orange counties represent the counties that will remain in Sweeten's AOR and blue are those that will be removed. Now, the September 23 notice of intent was eleven counties that were being removed, and it included Washington County. During discovery in this case, after Sweeten filed its protest, we learned that Sweeten had developed a relationship with the Blue Bell Creameries located in Washington County and had made a number of sales there, so out of fairness to Sweeten, Volvo issued an amended notice in July of 2014 that put Washington County back into the counties that Sweeten would keep. So the order that the ALJ entered was to remove the ten counties that are shown in blue on the map in front of you.

Now, the ALJ found good cause to remove those

counties, and you can see why on the map. The numbers that are shown inside each of the counties that are being removed constitute the total number of truck sales that Sweeten had in each of those counties from the time period January 1, 2009 all the way through the time of trial which was September 2014, nearly six years, and as you can see, there are zero sales in eight of the ten counties — talking about new truck sales. In the other two, Burleson County there's one sale that represents about a 2 percent market share, and then the other, Fort Bend County, there's eight sales out that's eight out of nearly 800 industry sales for about a 1 percent market share. So Sweeten clearly is not doing much in those removed counties.

Now, the parties had a fair trial. There was six days of trial testimony, there were fourteen witnesses, the parties introduced 154 exhibits. After the trial the parties submitted closing briefs, responded to the other side's closing briefs. The ALJ took all of that into consideration and wrote a 42-page proposal for decision, finding good cause for the modification.

And the good cause, as Mr. Duncan mentioned, was based on three of the statutory factors. First was Sweeten's sales in relation to sales in the market. You can see that they're substandard, the ALJ Found that

they're substandard. In the PFD he said that their performance overall was exceedingly low and that it's even more glaring in the removed counties, as you can see for yourself that's true. Sweeten's market share in the removed counties from 2010 through 2013, which was the relevant time period under the notice of modification, ranged from 0.3 percent to a high of 1.9 percent. Now, during that time frame, Volvo Trucks national market share was about 11 percent to 14 percent. So you can see that the ALJ was correct when he held that Sweeten's performance was unacceptable in the removed counties.

The board that I just put up in front of you shows Sweeten's new truck sales from 2010 to 2013, again, the time frame that was relevant at the hearing. 97.4 percent of all of Sweeten's truck sales were in the retained counties, the counties that it's keeping. Only 2.6 percent of those sales were in the removed counties, and as the ALJ noted in the PFD, Sweeten can continue to sell to customers in the removed counties after the modification, it's not an exclusive sales territory.

And the last board I'm going to show you, this one tells the same story as the previous one with new truck sales, this one tells the same story about service and parts sales. Service is shown in blue and parts sales are shown in orange. Again, only 2.2 percent of Sweeten's

service business and only 1.5 percent of its parts business is from customers in the removed counties, and Sweeten can continue to service customers and sell parts to customers in the removed counties after the modification.

2.5

When Sweeten's counsel gets up here in a few minutes and tells you that Volvo is trying to take away half of the sales territory, please remember what they're doing in that territory that's being removed, which is not much.

The second factor that the ALJ relied upon to find good cause was investments and obligations, and put simply, Sweeten has made no investments of any kind in the removed counties -- that was the evidence at trial. In fact, the ALJ said there would be no impact at all on Sweeten's investments and obligations caused by the modification, and that's true, there is no contrary evidence.

Third, the ALJ found that the modification was warranted based on the inadequacy of Sweeten's service facility and personnel. They've had an inordinate amount of turnover in their service department, including in the critical position of their service manager, their facilities are inferior to those of other dealers, they have an insufficient number of sales staff and trained

service technicians going back historically to 2009 through the time of trial.

I'd like to show you one other thing that's not a board. This binder was a trial exhibit, it's trial exhibit number 105, and it is some of the customer service complaints that Volvo Trucks received about the service department at Sweeten, and they're broken down and tabbed by customer name, and as you can see, there are a lot of them, it's a lot of customer service complaints, and it's not all of them. And some of them were pretty severe, some of them are customers like H.E.B. saying we're not going to buy Volvo trucks anymore because the service department at Sweeten can't service them for us. That's in the record in the case and relied upon by the ALJ in its finding.

So this evidence that I've mentioned and the other evidence relied upon by the ALJ do show good cause.

Now, I want to spend just a couple of minutes talking about what you're going to hear from Sweeten's counsel. They're going to have two main arguments, I think, against the PFD. One is they're going to argue that this existing circumstances language in Section 455 means that the ALJ should have only considered evidence that was contemporary -- in other words, at the trial he should have only looked at how is Sweeten doing right now

on its sales, on its investments and so forth. And the ALJ properly rejected that argument and noted that Sweeten has no authority for it, there's no case law authority for that argument, and it's clearly not workable, so the ALJ's rejection of that argument was proper.

The ALJ held the issue is not what Sweeten is trying to do now but what the evidence shows has been the case over the last few years, particularly in light of the fact that the modification proceeding began at the end of 2013. In other words, when the manufacturer sends the notice in 2013 that says here's the reasons why we have good cause to modify your AOR, that's what the trial is about, is about do you have good cause based on the performance leading up to that notice.

Please note that here on this issue Sweeten's counsel is going to say existing circumstances means now, what are we doing now, that's what existing means. Just remember that and then notice how their position changes on the next topic.

The next argument is that Sweeten is going to say, well, all this is just a pretext because Volvo wants to put a new dealership out on the west side and make sure that Sweeten can't protest it, and that's an existing circumstance that the ALJ should have considered. Again, the ALJ properly rejected that argument. The reason that

it was rejected is because there's a previous precedent from the board that's squarely against Sweeten. It's a case called Cardenas Enterprises v. Toyota Motor Sales and Gulf States Toyota. It was the exact same issue. Toyota and Gulf States wanted to modify the dealer's territory in Brownsville, and later at another point the dealer protested the modification and said it's going to harm me when you add a dealership in the future. And the board said evidence of modification in the future is not relevant to a modification case, different statutory factors apply, there are different requirements in an add point case and it's not an add point case, it's not relevant, that's the decision. The ALJ relied upon it properly in the PFD and it's not an existing circumstance.

Note in Sweeten's exceptions their counsel dropped a footnote talking about the existing circumstances argument, the first one, and said, Existing circumstances means something that exists now, in existence now. Well, any establishment of a future Volvo Trucks dealership in the west Houston area, the removed counties, does not exist now, there's no application for a Volvo Trucks dealership in those territories now, it's not an existing circumstance.

The remaining counties would still make up the second largest Volvo Trucks AOR in the State of Texas. We

have a population of over six million people, it has both Houston airports, major rail hubs and the Port of Houston, has 87.3 percent of the population of the current AOR, and as you saw, it's almost every bit of Sweeten's current business. In fact, 27 percent of all of the economic activity in the entire State of Texas is in the counties that Sweeten is going to retain.

So the ALJ's decision and the staff's recommendation are correct. There is good cause for the proposed modification and there's no legal basis to change the ALJ's PFD, so we ask that the board adopt the PFD and follow the staff's recommendation.

Thank you for your consideration, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. WALKER: I have a question.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: When you remove these counties from his area but you say that he can still sell trucks in those particular areas, let's say you established a new dealer, let's say that Bob Smith goes in there and you give him the franchise for that territory, does that preclude Sweeten from selling trucks in that area at that time, or how does that work?

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Member Walker. Excellent question. The answer is it absolutely does not

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

preclude them from selling in that territory. They're not exclusive sales territories. The answer is quite simply regardless of whether another dealership is established out there or where any such dealership is located, Sweeten is still perfectly free to compete with any such dealership in the future and can sell trucks and service trucks and sell parts to customers wherever they're located in the entire world, whether it's in those counties or anywhere else, it's free competition.

2.5

MR. WALKER: So the only thing he is precluded from doing would be brick and mortar?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Member Walker, but the dealer agreement gives Volvo Trucks the discretion to approve or disapprove any second location, so they don't have a right per se to establish another location within that territory anyway. But under the dealer agreement, to address what I think is your question, having the territory assigned to them just precludes the establishment of another dealership in that territory under the dealer agreement.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Can you pull the first map up, and where is the dealership currently located now?

MR. RUSSELL: The dealership is currently located here on the east side of Houston.

1	MS. RYAN: And with the proposed carve, where
2	would they be located?
3	MR. RUSSELL: Madam Chair, that's the most
4	important point that I could have possibly been asked a
5	question about. There is no proposed dealership.
6	MS. RYAN: I'm sorry. With the change, where
7	is it? You had the other slide
8	MR. RUSSELL: The change with respect to a new
9	dealership?
10	MS. RYAN: No, no, no. The existing one, with
11	regard to that other slide, in that one where is that?
12	MR. RUSSELL: East side of Houston, currently
13	the east side of Harris County.
14	MS. RYAN: Okay. I just wanted to get my
15	bearings. Thank you.
16	MR. RUSSELL: Sorry.
17	MS. RYAN: No. That's okay.
18	MR. SWINDLE: I had a quick question. What
19	type of notification was given to Sweeten as far as their
20	poor performance or their complaints before the
21	notification went out in September of '13?
22	MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Member Swindle. A
23	lot. In the evidence, among those 154 exhibits that I
24	mentioned to you, it is a lot of correspondence with
25	Sweeten going back over time, trying to encourage them to

perform better. We even for a while tried to encourage them to establish a second location on the west side of Houston, which they may mention in their remarks, and Volvo could not get Sweeten to commit to doing it. Many of the trial exhibits were about Volvo Trucks communication with Sweeten saying we need you to do stuff out there, we need you to sell, we need you to be active, we need you to cover your whole territory. It's a big market out there in those removed counties that they've completely ignored. And so, yes, sir, there was extensive communication and extensive efforts, even to the point of trying to get them to set up a second location out there which they just would never do.

2.5

And they're going to tell you in a few minutes that they tried to buy a property out there to set up a dealership and we wouldn't let them, and the reality on that point is that the first time that Sweeten put property under contract in those removed counties was after the protest had already been filed and after Volvo Trucks had already determined that they were not serious about setting up out there, and so we had told them that we were not going to approve them establishing a second location. So please bear that in mind when you hear that argument.

MR. PALACIOS: Counselor, how frequently does

1 Volvo modify a dealer's AOR when they underperform? 2 this common practice? 3 MR. RUSSELL: Member Palacios, you're asking 4 how many cases like this are there? 5 MR. PALACIOS: For Volvo. 6 MR. RUSSELL: The only one I'm aware of is this 7 one right here. 8 MS. RYAN: In Texas or the country? 9 In the country, as far as I know. MR. RUSSELL: 10 MR. PALACIOS: So normally how does Volvo 11 handle then underperforming dealers? If this is the only 12 case where you've actually tried to modify territory, I 13 would assume there's other practices that you use to get 14 them to comply. 15 MR. RUSSELL: Well, there are a host of other 16 ways that performance issues can be handled. Sometimes 17 dealers may agree to changes to their territory, sometimes 18 things can be worked out that don't get to this point. Sometimes the dealers, similar to in the automotive 19 20 industry, you may send notices to them of the deficiencies 21 in their performance and then they take steps to correct 22 it. Maybe additional satellite locations are established. 23 There's a whole host of other things that can happen that 24 most dealers respond to. Most dealers will take action.

It benefits the dealer to perform better in

2.5

1	these areas. That would have been to Sweeten's benefit if
2	they had actually gone and done something in those
3	territories. So it's the rare case when you have a dealer
4	like Sweeten that just simply refuses to cover its
5	territory.
6	MR. WALKER: So Keith, what is Volvo's market
7	penetration statewide?
8	MR. RUSSELL: In Texas?
9	MR. WALKER: In Texas.
10	MR. RUSSELL: The Texas average. Member
11	Walker, I don't know what it is today as we stand here.
12	MR. WALKER: The market penetration nationwide.
13	MR. RUSSELL: Roughly 15 percent.
14	MR. WALKER: Fifteen percent? And of the
15	removed area here, what would be the percentage of truck
16	sales in that particular area and what percentage does
17	nine trucks represent?
18	MR. RUSSELL: That's the numbers I mentioned
19	earlier. Depending upon the time frame that you're
20	looking at as to when the trucks were sold, from that time
21	period of 2009 through the time of trial, the market share
22	ranged from 0.3 percent to a high of 1.9 percent, because
23	that's our dealer there.
24	MR. WALKER: Total truck sales?

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry?

25

1	MR. WALKER: I thought that was in relationship
2	to their sales, but what is that in relationship to
3	what's the potential market in those particular counties?
4	I mean, I don't know how many trucks are sold in Fayette
5	county, I don't have the foggiest idea. There may be zero
6	potential buyers there.
7	MR. RUSSELL: I have those numbers and the ALJ
8	had those numbers and considered them, and I gave you a
9	couple of them with Burleson and with Washington counties.
10	So in general terms, the total market there where we've
11	got the nine sales for the time period that that relates
12	to, there are about 1,700 industry registrations, 1,734.
13	MR. INGRAM: The counties being removed, that's
14	the number, the potential?
15	MR. RUSSELL: That's the number of industry
16	registrations in that market during that time period.
17	Yes, sir.
18	MR. RUSH: It's the blue?
19	MR. RUSSELL: In the blue, yes, Member Rush.
20	MR. BARNWELL: Those are new vehicle
21	registrations?
22	MR. RUSSELL: Those are new heavy truck
23	registrations. Yes, Member Barnwell.
24	And all of that argument related to the market
25	share. That was all presented to the ALJ in the hearing,

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

it was all presented to the ALJ in the briefing, and it was all addressed in the PFD, and the ALJ still found good cause for the modification, just as the staff noted.

MS. RYAN: Any other questions?

(No response.)

MS. RYAN: Thank you very much.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. RYAN: The second comment card we have, we'd like to recognizes and welcome Representative Travis Clardy to the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. Thank you for your service. And also representing Sweeten Truck Center.

MR. CLARDY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to reserve five minutes if you could put that in the timer, so I'll do ten minutes and then the five minutes for rebuttal. Thank you, members and chairman, and thank you for your service to the State of Texas, for what you do. I know it's a lot of time out of your life and a lot of effort and appreciate what you're doing.

I would like to introduce a few folks before I get into the merits of the cases. Sitting in the back is Mr. R.C. Sweeten, Sweeten Truck Center. Sitting next to him is Dane Yeager, his general manager. And then, of course, counsel I worked with on this case, Mr. Bill Crocker. I think most of you may know Bill. It's good to

have them here in the courtroom. As I told them, this is our last chance for romance, and so we wanted to be here and give it our best shot.

The hard part about a case like this is boiling it down. We've been at this for over two years and we've been asked to summarize this to you in less than fifteen minutes, and I will tell you this is really about the last place that I wanted to be today, last place I expected to be today. I've asked myself from day one on this case:

Why are we here, why is this going on, why does this dispute even exist over this? It just makes no sense; it didn't make it then, doesn't make it now.

The funny thing with lawsuits, when you get into them it nearly always goes back to that first gut reaction, that first instinct you have when you analyze the facts. And one thing I'm particularly appreciative of the board today, the questions you have asked. I think you're having that same instinctual reaction that I had with the questions that you're asking. They just don't make a lot of sense.

I do want to just make one aside. The first question, commissioners, you asked, I had the same question. In my experience as a trial lawyer, usually the court's clerks don't clean up the failings of a party to point out the errors in the record or they're not getting

the right issues in front of the court, they're not hitting the right points. There was, I believe, a fatal flaw by the ALJ, but that's been corrected now. That's okay. We're going to win this on the strength of the merits of the claims and what we're going to discuss here today, what you're considering. That is an unusual thing; I had the exact same reaction. Why didn't we go back to the ALJ and point out the things that needed to be fixed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This case really, when you think about it, what is it about, what did we start with. It really comes down to why are they taking these counties away from Sweeten Truck Center? Mr. Russell made a comment that they're not taking it, there's not another dealer that's been located. Well, it kind of begs the question: Well, why take them, why not leave them alone, they're not exclusive sales What is the purpose for taking them? I will tell you everything that's happened in this case from day one has been pretextual that Volvo wanted to take away these sections not to serve those counties that have been identified in blue, the counties to the west, it is, in fact, it's entire purpose to put a new dealer just on this side of the line somewhere around Katy in that part of Houston. Our dealership currently is in the northeast 610 Loop area where there's a lot of trucking activity. want to put a place just outside that line to service that

area. This is about splitting R.C. Sweeten's dealership, this is about depriving him of half of the affected area. It's not about these counties, it's never been about these counties, I don't care what the letters say or anything else. It is about breaking up his valuable dealership and putting a new dealership in there.

2.5

You know, you guys are businesspeople, you know this. This has been something that R.C. has been working towards and trying to build. The comment was made that they've made no efforts for establishing another location. That is absolutely not true. We've had at least four properties under contract, they tried to identify prior to this ever coming up, and currently we have bought a property that is perfectly suitable for a location in west Houston. We do agree that would be a great way to service this market and provide Volvo services, parts and sales in this entirety of the existing AOR.

But to go back a little bit in time, some things you have to know about the history of the company. First off, Volvo came to R.C., not the other way around: Would you please be our dealer in Texas in the Houston area? And the place opened in 2004. They've had a stellar record as a dealer for years and years and years. Admittedly, there were problems in the 2011-2012 period, but let's remember we tried this in 2014. This is the

central framing of what the ALJ did when he reviewed this case. He locked in, and as Mr. Russell said a moment ago, look at this from 2013. That is not the right time period.

Wolvo sent a second amended notice letter two months before the trial. Frankly, I think the trial should have been and let us work on those issues. But they moved the time period forward into 2014, and within the record you will see that Sweeten Truck Center had solid service, solid parts, low turnover, all the things they said existed that may have been some problems in 2011 or '12 were no longer there. As we stand here today, Sweeten Truck Center as the best CSI, consumer satisfaction index, of any dealership in the country, 100 percent across the board all the time. It's a deal that we have continued to do a good job, but nevertheless, this litigation has persisted, and here we are trying to undo this difficult thing.

What they want to do is set up a Volvo dealership across the way in a thought that that could somehow create more sales for Volvo. And that's not what it's going to do, it's going to weaken. I feel sorry for whoever the second person is that gets talked into taking this dealership from Volvo in another part of the city. It's not going to work. They're going to have two

extremely weak dealers not being able to provide the quality service that the public deserves.

And let's think about what we're talking about. These are Volvo trucks. Some of you may not realize that Volvo makes heavy trucks. Until Chuck Norris got on TV, I don't think most people knew that. But why have their trucks underperformed where some markets they sell 15-20 percent and others in the oilfield applications it's a very low single digit number? Why is that? They make a fine truck, Volvo is a quality manufacturer, we're proud to represent Volvo, but what they don't make is a service truck, they don't make an oilfield truck. What's been our economy in the last five years? Where has the need for sales of heavy equipment been? It's been in the oilfield and oilfield applications in the service industry. That's not their niche, that's not their market.

And I'm reminded, I think they have Shakespeare in Sweden, they probably read that over there, what was it the Bard said: Dear Brutus, the fault lies not with the stars, it falls with us. And perhaps a little critical self-examination by our friends in the manufacturing industry would tell them we need to do something different if we're going to sell in Houston, we need to make a truck that people want to buy. There's no problem with other dealers sell with Kenworth, with Mack, with Peterbilt, et

cetera. Those are proven trucks in that industry; Volvo doesn't have that product. I think they've done an exceptional job at Sweeten Truck Center in selling with they have.

Now, I will tell you that the thing I think is not fairly addressed by the ALJ is the effect this is going to have on Sweeten Truck Center. This has been a business that R.C.'s has been building for over ten years, he's put a lot time, sweat, money, capital. He's prepared to do more. He's bought the property; he looked forward to establishing a new location in west Houston again if the manufacturer will allow him. We're ready and we're able to do that.

But you look at where it is now, you wouldn't be surprised to know -- I believe this is in the record -- that several attempts were made by Mr. Sweeten. Sometimes you're in a bad relationship and you just need to let it go and move on. He tried to do that. But you know how this is, there's no secrets in this business, once word is on the street, it's on the street. If somebody finds out you're involved in a litigation with the DMV, you're fighting with your manufacturer, you might lose half of your dealership, you tell me what effect that's going to have on the value of your business, what's that going to do to your ability to sell it in a fair way.

And so the decision was made to march forward with this and try to hold on. Efforts have been made to move the business and try to come to some resolution, all to no avail. So here we are with you, you're our last recourse to talk about these things, to try to do what's fair and what's reasonable and come back and correct what I think is a mistake of the ALJ in saying that Volvo is entirely correct in being able to these counties.

I would just as an aside, you have to notice that they did give us Brenham back. Now, I'm not saying Volvo is responsible of the closing of Blue Bell, but it is kind of interesting that's the county they gave us right before it happened.

But the point of it is, if you look in those counties, the sales aren't there, it's not about the sales. This is what I'm asking this board, the people that live in Texas, that know Texas, that travel in Houston, just use your common sense, what's going on here. If what they want to do is take the area and take half of it, just tell us what you're doing and why, and that's not what's happening here. This is a matter of fairness, of decency, of doing the right thing in the law and the right thing in business.

So I'm going to reserve the rest of time, I think I've got a few seconds left, and I'll come back and

finish with rebuttal. I'll answer any questions then or now, the board's pleasure.

MR. PALACIOS: Can I ask a question?

MS. RYAN: Absolutely.

MR. PALACIOS: Representative Clardy, I have a question. Twenty-six exceptions were filed I guess in response to the ALJ's PFD. Of those twenty-six, how many of those apply specifically to the three factors that would allow a modification or the vacancy of that PFD decision? How do they relate specifically to these three factors?

MR. CLARDY: Well, that's going to take a lot longer for me to go through and identify them. I will tell you that all these exceptions were specifically tailored with the able help of Bruce and Mr. Crocker, but my reading of these is they all very much relate to those factors of what you have to do for them to be able to take these areas. We can go through each one.

MR. PALACIOS: You don't have to go through all twenty-six of them, but I guess, obviously, for us to make any decision they really have to pertain to these three factors, so that end, that's your best thought?

MR. CLARDY: Right. And that's a fair question. What I'd like to do on that one, let me, as I'm sitting here listening to the next little portion, go

visit with my counsel and in my final five minutes I will nail that. I want to make sure that I get the right ones, because the smart guys are sitting over there, I'm just up here talking. Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Go ahead, and I've got a question after you.

MR. WALKER: I heard, I thought, in your comments -- and I may have misunderstood what you said -- you said you had looked at property in the particular area but then you just said they purchased property in the area. Which is it?

MR. CLARDY: It's both. I think the implication was that Sweeten did nothing to try to locate a west Houston location, and that's patently false, that's counter to the record. There were at least four attempts to locate property in the west Houston area, got them under contract, weren't able to close. Subsequent to the trial, in the last fourteen months, one of those properties, I think it was the very last property that we were dealing with, has actually been closed and is presently owned by Sweeten.

MR. WALKER: Where is that piece of property?

MR. CLARDY: It is inside the Houston area, the Katy-Brookshire area. Can't say that I've been there, but it's a property that's been looked at. And there was a

lot of due diligence. In fact, Volvo had people come from corporate and were identifying properties, because they have to give the green light to do that.

MR. WALKER: How bit a piece of property did you buy?

MR. CLARDY: What's the acreage? Six acres.

That all happened after the trial, they were closing, we were doing some of the stuff. But it's acceptable and it's the same size -- and I'm going on what I hear from Mr. Yeager who handled that sale -- but it's the same size of those similar locations, operations for this sort of facility in the area, more than adequate.

MS. RYAN: Go ahead, Marvin.

MR. RUSH: Can you tell me did you do any -- I see that that area where he only sold whatever it was, eight or nine trucks or something, how far back did you go, was that just one year, six years, three years, ten years?

MR. CLARDY: The last fiscal analysis on this,

I think that was just for the last year. And then you can
get into the weeds where they're not given credit for some
sales within that area and others because of where the
registrations were, where the trucks were actually
utilized. But the point is there have been minimal sales
throughout the entire period because there's not companies

1 operating fleets. MR. RUSH: I would like to see what he's done 2 3 in the last five-six years. 4 MR. CLARDY: Within the area they propose to 5 take? 6 MR. RUSH: What's that? 7 MR. CLARDY: You asked me how many were sold in the area? 8 MR. RUSH: No. I said I would like to see what 9 10 happened in those areas over the last five or six years 11 prior to being here. MR. CLARDY: And let me ask you is that 12 13 industry-wide truck sales or specifically Volvo? 14 MR. RUSH: Volvo trucks. 15 MR. CLARDY: Volvo trucks. 16 MR. RUSH: That's all I care about. 17 MS. RYAN: Quick question on the site -- two 18 questions, and I agree with Marvin's question, in the 19 sales it says that in the area, the proposed area in red 20 that there's a little over 1,200 competitive registrations which means there is a market in that area, yet Sweeten 21

Trucks did not sell into that market. So the question I

made into that market and that market was carved, the

would have is why, which goes to the statutory question of

So if in that three-year time frame sales were not

22

23

24

2.5

harm.

opportunity, you could still sell into that market, so there is still a sales market there, so that is a statutory factor of harm. So my question would be the opportunity to still sell into that market is there and there is still a buyer there because vehicles/trucks are still being registered there, so my question is you still have the opportunity that you had then yet the opportunity wasn't taken when it was in your area of responsibility. So it's kind of a question and a statement: help me understand where the harm is.

MR. CLARDY: Two points on that. One is it goes back to the vehicles that are made and manufactured and what their purpose is, and the registrations that are in the west boundary of the area aren't the ones that fit that market, that fit the oilfield market. That's why those sales are low of the Volvo truck compared to other registrations. That's one of the reasons that you see that drop off.

The harm, quite frankly, to me it's very obvious, yes, it's a non-exclusive area, you can sell outside that area, but I think the business ethics, as Mr. Sweeten testified to, are that you stay within your boundary lines and you don't directly compete with those that run up against you. Now, are you precluded from doing that, is it illegal to do that? No. But the course

and custom of the industry is to respect those lines. You put someone in west Houston that services those counties, they're going to be competing on that same entire Houston market. The counties are just the window dressing to get a second dealer in the western portion of the area. There are sales opportunities there, and again, they spent money and time and resources going into the ten counties to the west.

MS. RYAN: But I read that one of the reasons that the sales didn't look so good was that you didn't get credit for some of the sales that were outside of your area of responsibility.

MR. CLARDY: Right. And that's where I think you need to start parsing those up, where were the registrations, where were the trucks purchased and where are they domiciled and those things.

MS. RYAN: Okay. Understand.

MR. CLARDY: But I think that the value and what the obvious effect is on Mr. Sweeten's business, you take half of the geographic area with the knowledge that there's going to be a new competitor in that market, it greatly devalues his business, and I think at the end of the day, it's going to hurt the public in the service and parts because it's going to have two weakened businesses instead of one very strong vibrant business that's

operated by Mr. Sweeten.

MS. RYAN: Last question. Thank you. The land that was purchased, was that site approved by Volvo?

MR. CLARDY: No, and despite our best efforts before, during and after the trial. That's where I think the frustration at least on our side is, you know, why are we here. This is a good reputable solid company, a good operator, knows what they're doing, been in the business for years. We're prepared, willing and able to do exactly what they want to do and have been making good faith efforts throughout. Again, you go back to 2012-13, there have been some service issues, some parts issues. That's part of some turnover, but that's been handled, that's been dealt with. If you block up there and say we're only going to look at 2012-2013, then maybe you have a problem.

There's a question that you asked about is this the only place this has happened. I asked those questions during deposition. This is the only dealership that has gotten this treatment across the United States. You would think that means Sweeten Truck Center must be the very worst performing dealership in the country, the very worst sales, the very worst service, the very worst parts, the very worst turnover in management, et cetera. At the end of the day, if you add about a dozen trucks into the existing sales in this relevant time period, Sweeten comes

up to actually the average of Volvo sales for the country. We're slightly below average, we're not at the bottom of the barrel. There's no reason for Sweeten Truck Center to be singled out like they're being singled out before this board to have half the business stripped away, sold to somebody else, and they're not going to tell you that's what they're going to do.

MR. INGRAM: I have just a followup question to that, if you don't mind. You say that you're about average. Average compared to what? I mean, there's a lot of ways to look at that.

MR. CLARDY: Sure. We're going off of their numbers. They can explain that. But off of Volvo's numbers of market share, penetration, volume of sales, we're near the median point of sales.

MR. INGRAM: Is that the median point as in number of sales, or is that a median point as in penetration in that market that he's responsible for?

MR. CLARDY: Median point as far as penetration of Volvo trucks in that market, I think the expectations of them, but also in the volume of trucks. And again, this point was very much made in the record. I'm not here saying that Sweeten Truck is in the top 10 percent of sales of Volvo trucks. I don't think that's a problem with the sales force at Sweeten. R.C. can sell an Eskimo

an icebox. It's not the problem with the salesmen, it's a problem that the product doesn't fit in this market at this time. We would love nothing better. We've made these suggestions in the years we've operated the business: Volvo, help us, we will help you develop the market, let us give you the input what's going to sell in Louisiana, in Texas, in North Dakota, in the heavily intensive oil and gas markets. So far those have fallen on deaf ears, and so far the sales have stayed down as compared to their over-the-road trucks which perform exceptionally well and have a great market penetration.

MR. SWINDLE: Just a quick question so I can understand this. Does Sweeten have any other franchise agreements or do they operate any other trucks, or is the Volvo franchise agreement so limited they can only sell Volvo?

MR. CLARDY: It's a Volvo dealership only at this location and that was the intention of the west Houston location as well. And if I'm going to be very true with this, Mr. Sweeten does own and operate other dealerships that sell other products, okay, but they're not in the Sweeten Truck Center group. There's the Performance group, separate entity, and again, the same people operating these things, and I think you know this, the relationship between Volvo and Mack, so you look over

there and we're the same people, same folks, same business model, same effort, same everything, and they're blowing the top out of the market selling Macks. They did a great job holding their own and growing and developing the Volvo brand in this same market, albeit without the real vehicles they need to sell.

Now, I know a good carpenter doesn't blame his tools, and they're salesmen, it's their job to sell, but they have a remarkable job in the last since this -- I think before this started was making -- a year before this all came up, they were coming to us do the west Houston location. I don't know what happened. I don't know why this started. You know the history of R.C., they came to him, he's built the money, done the deal, done all of this a year before, why don't you look at Corpus Christi as a location, why don't you look at west Houston, we want to into these.

Then all of a sudden we're getting a letter saying we're taking half your -- and the most galling think about it -- and Mr. Russell actually said something to this effect -- literally have said we're doing you a favor by taking half your business, we're just trying to help you out, you've just got too much to handle, let us take half your business. You know, that's the old Cool Hand Luke line: Boss, I wish you'd quit being so good to

me. That's kind of what it reminds me of. They want to act like they're doing us a favor by stripping away half, obviously devaluing the business of Mr. Sweeten and whether to operate it or to try to sell it, and to say that it's about those counties and the sales, it's just not, it doesn't make sense.

MR. BARNWELL: Excuse me. How do you calculate it strips half the value of the business when less than 2 percent of the sales, parts, new truck sales is in those counties, how does that calculate?

MR. CLARDY: When I say half, I'm saying geographically we're taking of this. But the question you asked is what Volvo obviously wants you to believe. We're not harming him, we're just removing counties where he's not doing anything anyway, that's not going to affect the 98 percent of the business where the real sales made of Sweeten are.

MR. BARNWELL: Well, that sounds like a fact, though.

MR. CLARDY: But let's follow it through. Then if that's a fact, why move them at all, why not leave them where they are if they're not making sales? Because those aren't markets that they're going to sell the kind of trucks that Volvo sells. The only logical explanation, you're all right, you're seeing the same way we've seen it

since day one, since the first time that letter was received, this is about setting up a second dealer to compete with Sweeten because I think Volvo believes if I have two competing dealerships with Volvo going head to head with each other, somehow we'll sell more trucks. And the manufacturer should want to sell more trucks, but that is not what is going to occur.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Maybe the other side of it is it will so weaken Sweeten that he has to give up his business in a fire sale and they sell it to the people they really want. And it's not Joe Smith, we don't know who it is, but it's somebody, and it's one of those things that just doesn't pass the smell test. It is not about doing us a favor by taking away areas we can't currently serve, it's not about we can make sales in that area, it is about establishing a second competing dealership on the edge of that border where the population is where they think sales will be. Which, by the way, we see the same opportunity which is why we've looked at four properties and why we've closed on one and are ready to do exactly that. I would love nothing better than for this board to help Volvo solve its own problem, which is to support a dealer who can help them grow the Volvo market share of business in the greater Houston area, and there's nobody better than Sweeten Truck Center to do that.

MR. RUSH: Can I ask you a question?

MR. CLARDY: Please.

2.5

MR. INGRAM: I've been in the heavy duty truck business for fifty and a half years, about 150 or 160 dealerships in forty-one states, been doing this a long time. But in all my experience I've never had a manufacturer -- and I've had a lot of them -- ever, ever try to take some territory away from me, and that's because I do the job I'm supposed to do -- my people do, not me. I'm not defending anything, but it bothers me that all this time that territory hasn't been serviced, and if it was me I would be scared to death they were going to take it away from me. But I don't have that problem, never had that problem.

MR. CLARDY: And I will say neither has Mr. Sweeten. I think you gentlemen know each other, I think you know his business reputation, his sales and everything else.

MR. RUSH: I do, but I didn't know anything about this until I got here.

MR. CLARDY: But when you go through there, if you spend much time driving through those areas, you're not dealing with the businesses that are going to be buying over-the-road Volvo trucks which is the prominent use of that vehicle. And so I know that better efforts

1 could be made, and that is again why -- I don't mean to 2 arque, Mr. Rush, that is exactly why we were making 3 efforts to locate that new spot in west Houston before the 4 letter went out. 5 MR. RUSH: Was anything bought prior to this 6 thing coming up? 7 MR. CLARDY: Had two deals fall through, so the 8 answer, did we close on property, no. 9 MR. RUSH: Was there any property bought or a deal on. 10 11 The property had not been closed. MR. CLARDY: MR. RUSH: It's not hard to buy property if 12 13 you've got the money to pay for it. 14 MR. CLARDY: Well, Mr. Sweeten has the money to 15 pay for it and has. Again, we stand ready, willing and 16 able. 17 MR. RUSH: I'm not blaming anybody, I'm just 18 trying to get the story straight here. I'm not saying he 19 did a bad job there or he did a good job there, but 20 sometimes you have to -- the Volvo people know more about this than I do, I don't know anything about it. I used to 21 22 be a Volvo dealer in a couple of places, and I can't stand 23 the Swedes so I got out of it, I sold it back to them. 24 (General laughter.)

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. CLARDY: And so I appreciate the fact that

25

1 you understand some of the personality issues involved. 2 That was a long time ago. You're MR. RUSH: 3 telling Noah about the flood. 4 MR. CLARDY: All righty then. 5 MS. RYAN: Thank you. 6 MR. CLARDY: Thank you. 7 MS. RYAN: Let the record reflect that Board Member Walker is stepping out. We do still have a quorum, 8 9 though, so I will bring Mr. Russell back up. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. 10 MR. RUSSELL: I think 11 I only have about three minutes left so I'm just going to very quickly make a couple of points, and one of them is 12 13 to address your comments, Member Rush. The time period of 14 those sales was not one year, as Representative Clardy 15 just said, that was almost six years. 16 MR. RUSH: That's a six-year number, they are 17 not a one-year number. That was nine sales in all ten of 18 MR. RUSSELL: those counties from January 1, 2009 through the time of 19 20 trial which was September 2014. MR. RUSH: About five years. Okay. 21 22 understand that. I didn't understand that was for the 23 five or six-year period, whatever it was, so it's not just 24 a one-year picture.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

That's correct.

MR. RUSSELL:

2.5

MR. RUSH: You're telling me the six or nine trucks or whatever was sold, that's in essence five years?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, sir.

1.5

And I also want to address the comment that Representative Clardy made about the market share. All these arguments, by the way, everything they mentioned, was all raised at trial, was all briefed to the ALJ, and was all rejected by the administrative law judge. All these arguments have been made and reviewed by the staff, and the ALJ's decision should stand. All these arguments have been hashed out before the ALJ already.

I want to address the one point, though, about the margin share because I thought I heard Representative Clardy say that they only had to sell about twelve trucks and they're already average. That's completely contrary to all of the evidence in the case. Sweeten's market share, I mentioned earlier that Volvo trucks during that time period was in the range of 11 to 14 percent.

Sweeten's overall market share ranged from 1.2 percent to 5.8, so in the whole AOR they're not an average dealer, they're below average. And when you look at a market like Houston, Texas, that's a big important market for a manufacturer like Volvo Trucks, and when you have a dealer sitting in Houston, Texas clocking a 1.2 percent market share, that's harmful to the manufacturer. The

representation that was made that they're just a few trucks away and they're average, that's totally contrary to all of the evidence, and all that's in the PFD.

The other thing I wanted to mention was I also thought I heard him say that this issue with the findings of fact was a fatal flaw. The general counsel sent us a letter three weeks ago or more that said, Here's what I'm going to do in my staff recommendation to the board, and here's the findings of fact that I'm going to propose, and if you have any questions or you have anything you want to say about it, send me a letter by November 2 -- I think was the date. No letter was forthcoming. Sweeten didn't complain about those findings of fact, and neither did we.

The reason is because the PFD contains an analysis on all those points. The judge analyzes the evidence, and he says, for example: The parties presented evidence of benefit or harm to the public, I don't find any impact. So that's already in the PFD and now through this addition it's added. But to suggest that it's a fatal flaw, after not even raising an objection, I think should be disregarded.

The other thing I wanted to address is this issue about the effect on Sweeten and talking about how taking away those counties is going to take away half the value of their dealership, which it was stated and then

retracted. That issue was precluded at trial because they never disclosed it to us. At trial Sweeten tried to put on evidence of diminished value of its dealership, and we objected because we asked in discovery give us your evidence of any loss of value of your dealership and they gave us nothing, zero. There was no testimony given to us, there was no documentation given to us, and so when we got to trial and they tried to tell the ALJ, hey, you're going to take away value from our dealership, we objected and said, They never disclosed any of this. And the judge said, That's correct, you're not allowed to testify about something that you don't disclose in discovery.

So the record in this case, the record that controls the decision that's made here today has zero evidence of any diminished value to Sweeten Truck Center as a result of this modification. We asked in discovery: How's this going to harm you; if you think it's going to harm you, show us how. Nothing, not one piece of paper, not one bit of deposition testimony, nothing in the trial. So really to raise that here today, after the judge's ruling that it was inappropriate and couldn't come up at trial, I think is inappropriate here too.

The issue on the purchased property, I think we've covered. I didn't say that Sweeten didn't make any efforts to buy property, I said they didn't buy any, and

we had been asking them to buy property, we had been asking them to set up a second location, and they would not do it. During that same time period when we were asking them to buy property, they bought property in that same territory for their Performance Truck operations. So the same place where they're saying, well, we looked and we couldn't find any property and we tried but couldn't find any, somehow they bought some for their other brand in the same area, so you can understand the reason why Volvo Trucks didn't want to continue to talk to them about this, and instead needs to go a different way.

Volvo Trucks is entitled to be represented in that market and it's a big strong independent truck market. I think the testimony at trial was that that's a stand-alone area of responsibility just through the counties --

MR. DUNCAN: Madam Chair, I'd just like to point out that he ran out of time about two minutes ago.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry. It's the seventh largest area of responsibility in the State of Texas just through those counties, so this notion that they just can't sell it because a good enough truck is just false.

MR. INGRAM: I have a clarification questions,
Mr. Russell. The Volvo national market share is somewhere
between 11 and 14 percent. Is that what I heard

1 originally? MR. RUSSELL: During the time of trial for the 2 3 time period, that was the testimony at trial for the time 4 period that was relevant at trial. 5 MR. INGRAM: So between 11 and 14 percent nationwide. 6 7 MR. RUSSELL: That's correct. MR. INGRAM: Okay. And then for the entire 8 9 area, the entire AOR, Mr. Sweeten's penetration you're 10 telling me is around 2 percent? 11 MR. RUSSELL: It ranged from 1.2 percent to 5.8 12 percent. 13 MR. WALKER: Total truck sales in the market? 14 MR. RUSSELL: I'm sorry. That's Sweeten Truck Center's market share. 15 16 MR. WALKER: That wasn't the question. The 17 question was what was his market penetration in the entire 18 territory. 19 MR. RUSSELL: That is the combined number, that 20 is the number for the combined territory, Member Walker. MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Russell, you showed a binder 21 22 filled with customer complaints. Is that unusual for a 23 Volvo dealer? Is that a higher volume than normal? MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Member Treviño. 24 Wonderful 25

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

question and I thank you for it, because I think the

statement was made earlier that Sweeten is being singled out and they're a great dealer. The testimony at trial, the undisputed testimony at trial was that that is the most egregious service history of any dealer. David Waring from Volvo Trucks testified -- and he was in Mr. Finley's previous position being in charge of the dealer network -- that he'd never seen it before, he'd never seen a dealer with such a pervasive history of serious customer service complaints that it rose up to the level of having to be addressed at the executive level of Volvo Trucks. It's extremely unusual.

2.5

The dealerships, that's their bread and butter, their service department and their parts department, that's their bread and butter, and most dealers work hard to make sure that their customers are satisfied, and that stack of complaints is extremely unusual, it's not indicative of a dealership that you would want to have representing you in a new territory, and it's not indicative of a dealership who is really trying hard to represent the brand properly.

MS. RYAN: Thank you very much.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. CLARDY: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to close on this.

I want to come back to the question that you

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

asked, which specific special exceptions. They all deal generally with the notion of all existing circumstances and the failure to consider all existing proof. The answer is they focus on all existing circumstances. There were a number of special exceptions that were attached. Unfortunately, the way we found this, we did not enumerate those, but if you look on page 14, it would really be the first three which makes sense, make our strongest arguments in the first three special exceptions on that point were that all existing circumstances weren't included.

And as an example, the box was put up here of all these customer complaints. Those aren't all customer complaints, and as you would expect, having been in the business, you go back and look at things and you analyze what happened here. There were several complaints from large fleets that within months were writing letters thanking the dealership for the good work they'd done to correct these and look forward to doing business with Sweeten in the future.

There are going to be times where mistakes are made and things have to be fixed. That's what they were doing, and those have been cured. And again, when the first letter was sent on July 13 and the letter right before the trial, the letter we received just a couple of

months before the trial, remarkable improvement had been made. They went out, got the right kind of people, put them in the right spots, and to this date continue to enjoy exceptional customer satisfaction indexes, part sales, et cetera, service are really exemplary.

So you know, they pull out some documents from four or five years ago of those historical complaints to say you need to take these ten counties away from their responsibility just doesn't really hold up, I don't think.

For the little bit of time I have remaining, a couple of things I think that I would like to point out.

One is about the errors being pointed out. They were pointed out. We didn't need to send a letter, we filed the special exceptions, we filed a response by that time.

I do appreciate the staff's work on this, and again, I think that they were technically correct, it's just, again, I think my way of viewing things as a trial lawyer it's kind of unusual to see the staff do that.

But as far as what we've done, again, nothing was done to cure the substantive failure of the ALJ to consider all the facts and circumstances that are relevant to show that this modification of the dealer agreement should not be approved by this board.

You know, when you get down to it, Mr. Rush, whether we had under contract, anybody that's ever bought

a piece of property know that things can fall out, going to fall through, decide if you have the earnest money. It was never a problem of the money or the commitment to do it, there are times when it won't pass an environmental check, or it's not going to be quite large enough, or there was a problem with the title. All those things.

Now, we all know what excuses are and what that sounds like. Did they close? No, but they have.

And that's kind of where I think what I would suggest to you is there's been comments about what can you do and what's the authority for this and there's no cases to support this. Well, that's exactly what you are, that's what this board is. You have the statutory authority completely within your bounds and your discretion to look at this and determine what the law is and also what the law should be. This is your opportunity to deal with this fairly.

You've heard things about maybe some of the difficulty of dealing with a particular manufacturer.

That said, we have a long history with Volvo. I believe that this relationship is salvageable, and not only salvageable, it can prove to be very beneficial and fruitful for both. I think the right thing to do to go forward is for this board to take action, and frankly, they've said that we're doing you a favor by taking nearly

half of the counties from you. Well, maybe this is your chance to do Volvo a favor. Maybe they started something and gotten down the road they didn't really mean to go down or get down and didn't expect it to get to this point either, but sometimes you get locked in and you get there and you're in a place you never wanted to be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't think these are bad people, I've enjoyed and appreciated working with counsel on this case. I appreciate the sincerity and if you have the business and you want to sell your trucks, you ought to do what you think is best. But I think right now, using the hindsight that's available to you, the authority that you have to make this decision, now is the time to do Volvo a favor. You know, Keith Richards and Mick Jagger said it pretty well not too long ago: You can't always get what you want but you can get what you need. And what they need is what they've already got. They've got R.C. Sweeten and Dane Yeager and a fine team at Sweeten Truck Center that does exactly what they want to do: prepare to stay in the market to sell these trucks, to promote them, to spend money, to service them, to have parts, to have good quality people. They're the brand name for Volvo.

I think by doing what they asked they will look back in a few years and say that was not a good sound business decision. Sometimes courts have to do things

like save parties from themselves. We think this is an 1 2 opportunity for, again, you to do that with Volvo and 3 let's do our very best job of helping this dealership sell trucks for Volvo. 4 5 And I appreciate your time and attention. I'll 6 be happy to answer any more questions, or I can go try to 7 see if I can make that flight. MS. RYAN: And thank you. 8 9 Any questions? 10 (No response.) 11 MR. CLARDY: Thank you. MR. WALKER: Madam Chair, I would like to make 12 13 a motion. 14 MS. RYAN: Yes, sir. Let's take a quick recess real quick. 15 16 take a five-minute recess very quickly. Thank you. 17 (Whereupon, at 10:31 a.m., a brief recess was 18 taken.) 19 MS. RYAN: All right. We'd like to get started 20 again, please. For the record, it's 10:37 and the meeting will be called back into order. We're almost all ready. 21 22 Thank you. 23 MR. WALKER: Madam Chair, I'd like to make a 24 motion.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. RYAN: Yes, sir.

25

1	MR. WALKER: Under Government Code 2001.05(a),
2	it allows for the agency to overrule or to look at a
3	reversal of an administrative law judge's decision only if
4	we find that there has been a misapplication or
5	misinterpretation of the applicable law or that a
6	technical error has been found within the rulings. In
7	light of that, today I do not feel like that there has
8	been any proof shown to me or presented to the board today
9	that there has been a misapplication or a
10	misinterpretation of the law, therefore, I would like to
11	make a motion that the board move to accept the
12	administrative law judge's decision on this case and to
13	move it forward.
14	MS. RYAN: We have a motion to accept the ALJ's
15	PFD. Does that include the additional recommendations by
16	staff, or as proposed by the ALJ?
17	MR. WALKER: I think we just take it as it was
18	proposed by the ALJ.
19	MR. INGRAM: I think that do you have a
20	comment?
21	MR. WALKER: We don't even have a second yet.
22	MS. RYAN: So before we have a second, can I
23	ask if we make a second on that does that put us in a
24	precarious situation since it doesn't have all seven
25	factors?

MR. DUNCAN: The staff would prefer that all seven factors be addressed simply because the statute does seem to direct that the final conclusion of the case will present a finding on all seven factors.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And just to remind the board and to sort of walk you through that draft final order that we have, each one of those, if you jump back and forth between the staff's summary, primarily on page 3 going to page 4, the only items that were truly -- and I won't say added -- the only items that were really further elaborated on greatly by the staff are numbers five, six and seven, which in our draft final order would be proposed findings of fact 94, 95 and 96, and even with those, and with all of the ones that we have drafted, if you will look at the staff's summary in section 3 beginning on page 3, each one of those has a footnote and that footnote refers to material in the PFD. So we're taking the judge's words and just turning them into findings of fact and conclusions of law. It's not that the judge did not discuss these in the PFD at all, the judge did, we think that it's cleaner to have specific findings of fact and conclusions because that's what the statute seems to direct.

MS. RYAN: So procedurally, if I hear you correctly, procedurally the staff is recommending that any motion that this board takes up that we should include the

1 complete statutory seven factors for any decision that we make a decision on? 2 3 MR. DUNCAN: Yes, ma'am. 4 MS. RYAN: So I would recommend that either, Johnny, you amend your motion so that any decision this 5 board makes a decision on includes all seven of the 6 7 statutory factors. That would be my recommendation. MR. WALKER: So let me amend my motion in order 8 9 to, I guess, implant the seven factors into the motion 10 recommended by the staff. Is that a correct way to do 11 that, Ms. Lingo? MS. LINGO: Your general counsel would probably 12 13 answer that. 14 MR. WALKER: Mr. Duncan. 15 MR. DUNCAN: If it incorporates the findings 16 and conclusions that we suggest in our draft final order, 17 yes, sir. 18 MR. WALKER: So attach that to my motion then, please. 19 20 MR. BARNWELL: Second. MS. RYAN: Is there any discussion? 21 22 MR. INGRAM: So I think it's clear but just to 23 make sure that we're 100 percent clear -- is it accept or 24 adopt this final order? 2.5 MR. DUNCAN: Adopt.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	MR. INGRAM: This is to adopt the final order
2	written by staff, including the findings of fact 90
3	through 96. Correct?
4	MR. DUNCAN: Yes, sir. And conclusion of law
5	10-A. There's a conclusion of law that accompanies that.
6	MS. RYAN: So we have a motion to accept the
7	staff's recommendation with regard to amend the ALJ's PFD
8	to include all seven factors and he conclusion of law 10-
9	A. Is that correct? We have a motion and second, motion
10	by Member Walker and a second by Member Ingram.
11	MR. WALKER: Barnwell.
12	MS. RYAN: Barnwell. Sorry, Barney.
13	MR. WALKER: And the motion is to accept the
14	decision of the PFD of the administrative law judge.
15	MR. DUNCAN: The conclusion, yes.
16	MS. RYAN: The conclusion.
17	MR. WALKER: With the conclusion, yes.
18	MS. RYAN: Discussion?
19	(No response.)
20	MR. WALKER: I call for the vote.
21	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand,
22	please.
23	(A show of hands: Barnwell, Caraway, Ingram,
24	Ryan, Swindle, Treviño and Walker.)
25	MS. RYAN: We have seven. We have Members

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Swindle, Walker, Ryan, Caraway, Treviño, Barnwell and Ingram.

All opposed?

2.5

(A show of hands: Palacios and Rush.)

MS. RYAN: Members Palacios and Rush.

The motion carries seven to two. Thank you.

Next we will move to -- we're going to skip item 4.A before we go back into our second executive session because we aren't able to take any action items until we go into the second executive session, so we're going to go to 5.A. and take the finance and audit.

5.A.1, quarterly financial reports, Ms. Flores.

MS. FLORES: Good morning. For the record, my name is Linda Flores. I'm the chief financial officer for the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. And today we are reviewing the quarter ending August 31 financial division for the department.

The agency's revenues for the last quarter of the fiscal year did show a dip, a slight dip in registration revenue. We believe that this is a result of the single sticker program that was initiated in March. So you will see on the last line -- which is not easily seen -- June, July and August revenue seems to dip. It goes from \$155 million to \$146 million to \$141 million, but overall for the year we did collect more revenue than

we anticipated. We are closely monitoring the impacts of the single sticker program that was implemented in March. We won't really know or be able to identify what that trend is until we have more data points. And in the next March of 2016 we are implementing what we're calling single sticker phase II which is where we're syncing up both registration and inspection, so once we hit that milestone we'll be able to identify what the true impact was for single sticker.

For the first couple of months for the next fiscal year we have seen a little bit of a rise in those revenues but as I mentioned, we have seen a slight dip. We're also not projecting our normal growth trend for registration. Normally we project a 2.25 or 2.5 percent growth rate. For the next fiscal year we're only anticipating to grow by 1.5 percent.

The other revenue that seems to be on a decline is associated with the motor carrier industry. We have identified some declines in that revenue as it kind of matches up with the oil and gas industry. So a lot of the data that we have out there for oil and gas indicates that that revenue is also in a decline.

For the My Plates contract, this is a new contract, it's the second five-year term, and that particular program is doing well. They have brought in

approximately \$3.8 million on new sales for the fiscal year -- since the inception of the contract -- excuse me -- and they're on target to meet their obligation to the state in the next five years.

MR. WALKER: Back to single sticker and the revenues going on, why would single stickers have a negative impact on registration sales?

MS. FLORES: Before the single sticker program went into effect last March, we believe a lot of people went in early to avoid having to deal with inspections and registration and having to be within a certain timeline. So we saw a big spike last March and we believe it was people going in early just to avoid the change that they knew was coming. We do have some issues where we believe people are being turned away because they don't have valid inspection, and so there might be some timing issues going on where people are having to go get their car inspected, then come back in. There could be some instances where people are not able to get their car inspected for whatever reason, and so they're having to work through those issues.

The other thing that we can identify is -- and I'm looking over at Jeremiah Kuntz to kind of help me explain some of the things that are going on -- exempt registrations are also part of the equation.

1	MR. WALKER: Well, I'm just not sure how single
2	sticker which says that they have to do both things that
3	they had to do in the past would reduce registration
4	revenue.
5	MS. CARAWAY: If they don't have their
6	inspection done, then we send them away.
7	MR. WALKER: So they're not registering their
8	cars.
9	MR. INGRAM: Well, they can't. I hadn't
10	thought about this, but there is going to be a subset of
11	the population that has a car that will not pass and they
12	do not have the ability or funds to fix it, and so they
13	don't have a choice at this point now, they can't register
14	the car, they can't get it inspected, so they're kind of
15	locked into a trap.
16	MR. WALKER: So either there's going to be less
17	cars on the road or ticket revenue is going to be up.
18	MR. INGRAM: Ticket revenue might be up, yes.
19	(General laughter.)
20	MS. RYAN: Jeremiah.
21	MR. KUNTZ: For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz,
22	director of Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.
23	We are monitoring this closely. We are looking
24	at the number of registered vehicles that are on the road.
25	We have not seen a dramatic dip in the number of

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

registered vehicles that we have in the system. That is something that we're monitoring; we're monitoring the revenues as they come in. There are a lot of things that we're looking at.

Part of what Ms. Flores was talking about is we're still early in this, we do not have a full year's worth of data. We really believe that we need to have this run for a full year to really be able to assess what the impact has been. We know that there are going to be some challenges with the initial year rollout. There's going to be people that are adjusting. All we have right now is anecdotal evidence, we don't have anything that we could point to that says that there is a specific known cause, we do hear anecdotally.

We actually testified in front of the House Transportation Committee, one of the questions that came up was in regards to trailers that are over 4,500 pounds. There have been a lot of folks that are in the public that did not know that a trailer that is over 4,500 pounds required an inspection, so for years they did not know that they were out of compliance with that. Because of the single sticker program, they are now being made aware that there is an inspection required and so that they're having to go and get those vehicles inspected and come back in.

So as Ms. Flores talked about, we believe, anecdotally, that there are some timing issues going on with people that are coming in that would have normally been registered this month that maybe it's taking them a month or two to get registered because they're having to go out and do those inspections that they either were not aware of or that they just hadn't done it yet.

MR. WALKER: So when I looked at this the other night, for the last two years, those same quarters, we had -- sometimes y'all have told us that, well, people register or there's a big bunch of cars that come in around Christmastime or whatever, but if you look historically back at our revenues, they increased in this third quarter always and gone up by about 5 percent, and now we have about a 5 percent downtrend in our deposits. So there's a loss somewhere of no new growth and a diminishment of the vehicles that we do have registered, apparently.

MR. KUNTZ: I believe as Ms. Flores was talking about, when we looked at the year, the full fiscal year, we are in line with normal growth in our registration revenue which is around 2 to 2.5 percent, and that's why we're hesitant to make a determination as to the impact that single sticker has had just in this six-month period because we don't have a full year's worth of data to see

on a full year what happened. There are many factors that can drive registration revenue during the year: the number of vehicles that are traded in, new sales, if there's a large event like a flooding event that causes a bunch of vehicles to be salvaged and replaced. So there are a lot of different factors that get factored in and it's difficult for us in only six months of time to be able to make a full determination as to the impact that this program has had.

MR. WALKER: So you're saying on one hand that registration numbers are diminishing by very much but deposits have diminished and it's a direct correlation between the two unless you're saying that there's been more diminishment and more expensive registrations than there has been in auto registrations.

MS. FLORES: At this point we still don't have enough data points to really pinpoint which particular category of vehicles are not coming in with the deposits. All we know right now is that, yes, we've seen a slight dip, we are not projecting the same type of growth that we've had in the past, and we continue to monitor. But overall, we did collect more revenue than we did last year.

MR. BARNWELL: Why are you projecting the smaller growth this year and where do you get that?

MS. FLORES: For FY16? A couple of factors.

One is that oil and gas industry is going to be impacting oversize/overweight so that's one fee type. For registration, we have no seen the same type of growth in registered vehicles that we have in the past. It's tending to increase a lot slower or not as great, 2.25 percent has been the trend, we're just estimating 1.5 percent.

MR. BARNWELL: For your budgeting.

MS. FLORES: For the next year.

MR. BARNWELL: Okay.

MS. FLORES: Because we're taking into account some of this dip that we've seen for the last quarter.

MS. BREWSTER: Madam Chair, if I may?

MS. RYAN: Yes.

MS. BREWSTER: Whitney Brewster, executive director.

I think it's important to note that if you look at FY15, the August numbers for FY15 over FY14, they are very comparable, and so although for the months of June and July we've seen things flatten a little, we've seen a slight uptick in August. And so as we said earlier, it's premature to say if this is a long-term trend or just a short little anomaly, but we will certainly keep the board in the loop as we move forward.

MS. FLORES: Moving on, for the last quarter of the year on our expenditures we did very well. We are anticipating to lapse a million and a half of our total budget, and this is compared to approximately \$3 million that we lapsed in fiscal year 2014. So this was a result of a midyear review process where we redirected some of our budget to those areas that we had identified that had some gaps, and so we're doing much better than we have in the past.

For our capital projects, we are anticipating to carry forward, and you'll see this number, \$29.8 million into fiscal year 2016. And these particular line items which make up the automation projects are the detail to support that carryforward into the next year. You'll notice it's primarily composed of a couple of items, the automation system project, \$23.9 million, and technology upgrades.

We are in them midst, if I can say that, we are really close to completing our financial statements for the fiscal year 2016. There is a report that's due to the Comptroller this month, and so we will be bringing you a report back probably in January to kind of give you an update as to how the agency's financial statements look.

And with that, I'll conclude my presentation and address any questions you may have.

1	MR. WALKER: I have one more question about the
2	budget.
3	MS. FLORES: yes, sir.
4	MR. WALKER: Under professional fees and
5	services, we budgeted for \$39 million and we still have
6	half that left, there's about \$19 million, roughly, out
7	there.
8	MS. FLORES: That's primarily
9	MR. WALKER: RTC stuff that we haven't spent?
10	MS. FLORES: Correct.
11	MR. WALKER: So it's just strictly the
12	automation stuff.
13	MS. FLORES: Yes, sir, the automation
14	refactoring project.
15	MR. WALKER: And that's just because we haven't
16	funded that or it's just not scheduled to be funded at
17	this point?
18	MS. FLORES: It's scheduled to continue into
19	the next fiscal year.
20	MS. RYAN: Any other questions?
21	(No response.)
22	MS. RYAN: Thank you.
23	MS. FLORES: Thank you.
24	MS. RYAN: We'll move to Internal Audit
25	Division status. Sandra and Arby. Item 2.A.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. VICE: Madam Chairman, members, Ms.

Brewster. I'm Sandra Vice, I'm the Internal Audit

director. And with me is Arby Gonzales who is the deputy

director of Internal Audit. And today we are just

providing a status update on division activities, and this

is for informational purposes only, there is on item that

requires board action today.

2.5

The report that I'll be reading from starts on page 43 of your board book, and the first thing is we wanted to let you know how we're doing closing out last year's annual audit plan. We had two outstanding audits and we have completed both of them. One is a confidential report that followed up on implementation of information security recommendations, and the other report is on your desk, it is a hard copy, looks like this, and I'm going to let Mr. Gonzales, who was the lead auditor, talk about that audit and give you a summary of the report.

MR. GONZALES: Good morning, Madam Chair, board members, Ms. Brewster. For the record, I'm Arby Gonzales, the deputy director of the Internal Audit Division. I'm presenting the report for an audit of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles administration of statutes and rules through tax assessor-collectors, which you should have a hard copy of.

The first chapter of the report focused on

whether TACs remitted registration and title fees to the TxDMV on a timely basis. We determined that more than 65 percent of TAC offices sent either a registration or title fee collection late to the TxDMV for the periods that we tested, and that represents about \$31 million out of the \$180 million which were late for the periods that we tested. We recommended actions that the TxDMV management can take to strengthen its enforcement over late registration and title fee remittances. Management has agreed with the recommendations and has begun working on implementing them.

2.5

The second chapter of the report which you can find on page 9 provides information on TAC office practices related to the gold standard. Please note that our duty was to compile information for the TxDMV to use as a starting point for developing a recognition program which is commonly referred to as the gold standard. We did not intend to provide a final product. We obtained feedback from TxDMV management and the Tax Assessor—Collector Association's education TXDMV liaison subcommittee on the gold standard. We also surveyed fifty TAC offices of various sizes across the state, forty-four of which provided responses to us.

There are five key points that summarize our work on the recognition program which are: number one,

the TxDMV can verify participation and recognition levels on a periodic basis; number two, a tiered recognition program that consists of bronze, silver and gold stars could recognize various service levels at TAC and TxDMV regional offices; number three, criteria for the recognition levels can take county size into consideration; number four, achievements could align with TxDMV philosophies and goals related to performancedriven, optimize services and innovation, and consumercentric; and number five, the TxDMV will have to create processes and tools to support this recognition program.

Sandra and I are available to answer any questions or comments you may have regarding this report. Thank you.

MS. VICE: If there are no questions about the report, just to finish my update, we've already begun work on the 2016 which is the current Internal Audit plan.

We've completed the first project which is completing the annual internal audit report that goes to the Governor's Office and external legislative agencies, so that was submitted before November 1, as is required. In addition, we've started work on the fraud prevention program and we'll present that report at the next board meeting.

Finally, I wanted to let you know that we are engaged in several external audits. For example, the

Motor Carrier Division, which Mr. Jimmy Archer heads, successfully underwent a review of the heavy vehicle use tax. The money that's collected through this goes to the trust fund for transportation projects, and Mr. Archer and John Poole, who works for him, successfully underwent that review. They're going to have another review coming up, and I made a mistake, I put November 11-12, the actual onsite visit is the 18th and 19th of this month, and they will be undergoing a peer review of the international registration plan.

2.5

And finally, the State Auditor's Office continues to do followup work on the previous audit that they did. They do a financial audit every year, and so they're completing their work. The result of that is expected in February.

And that concludes our briefing. Any questions?

MS. RYAN: No. Just thank you for the briefing. I'll add regarding the tax assessor-collectors and the gold standards, that work will continue through a working group committee. Is that correct?

MS. VICE: That's correct. It is just a starting point and so the agency will identify other stakeholders to work with to continue to develop that.

MS. RYAN: So that will be ongoing?

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. VICE: Yes, ma'am.

2.5

MR. PALACIOS: Ms. Vice, I have a question. I know we've had various audits and investigations that come up that were unforeseen. In light of that, are you going to be able to complete the current audit plan with the staff that you have, and I guess, looking forward maybe we need to make sure that we take into consideration what's been happening throughout the year. Again, these things were unforeseen but I know they do take up an ample amount of your staff's time.

MS. VICE: Thank you, Mr. Palacios, for that.

This is the first time that we have been fully staffed for a long time, and the results are showing in that we've just completed the plan. We are on track right now to hopefully complete the plan on time instead of carrying over projects. That can change if there are a lot of other projects that we're not anticipating to take up our time.

The other thing is that the audit plan that I presented to you included about five projects, but then it also included additional projects that we could do if we had additional resources. So the more resources we have, the more work, the more assurances that we can provide the agency.

MR. PALACIOS: Thank you.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. VICE: Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

We'll move to item 5.B, legislative implementation. Caroline Love.

MS. LOVE: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the board. I'm Caroline Love, the director of Government and Strategic Communications for the department.

This morning I have an update for you on our efforts for implement, but I thought first I'd cover a couple of the interim charges that have come out within the recent past so you are aware of some of the efforts that we'll be undergoing during the interim.

In mid October the lieutenant governor issued several interim charges for Senate committees to consider, and Senate Transportation does have a couple that we'll be monitoring closely and provide input on as those hearings come up. They include a review of transportation funding, including new and anticipated revenues for transportation projects, and of course, many of our revenues, such as the registration revenues, are deposited for transportation funding, so that's something we may be involved in.

Another charge relates to the vehicle inspection program and looking at the efficiency and effectiveness and looking at recommendations on how to

streamline that process. And then there's also a review that the Senate Transportation Committee has of oversize and overweight vehicle registrations and penalties associated with violations, so I'm sure we'll be involved in that one as well.

In addition, the Senate Business and Commerce Committee has a review of all occupational licenses that are currently issued by the state to determine which ones are still necessary and which ones are no. In addition, when Speaker Strauss released his interim charges last week, there was a House Licensing and Administrative Procedures Committee interim charge that was very similar to that one, so both the House and the Senate plan to look at occupational licensing in pretty good depth in this interim.

And so on to the House committees. The House Homeland Security and Public Safety Committee has an interim charge looking at the implementation of Two Steps, One Sticker, the single sticker program, and how that has been implemented and how well it's going. So that's something we can anticipate providing testimony on during the interim. And in addition, the House Judiciary and Civil Jurisprudence Committee has an interim charge related to a full review of the Lemon Law, so that will be an interesting one as well.

The House Transportation Committee has a few interim charges that we'll be monitoring but they don't have as much of an impact on our day-to-day activities. Those include looking at the future of autonomous vehicles and how they add to safety and congestion relief but also probably how they would operate on the roads, and a review of the oversight/overweight corridors that are currently in existence and how those fees that are assessed cover impacts to those roadways they travel on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

So we'll continue to monitor those hearings and interim charges as they come up for review. There was a hearing earlier this week of the House Select Committee on Transportation Planning. There was a bill that passed during the session, House Bill 20, that put several planning related performance measures in place for the Texas Department of Transportation, and one of the charges of the bill was for the House and the Senate to create joint committees to look at the planning efforts on that, and the House committee met on Monday and asked us to provide testimony on projected revenues for transportation funding. So Linda Flores and Jeremiah Kuntz provided that testimony earlier this week and gave the committee information on what we have received when it comes to transportation revenues and what we anticipate will be available in the next biennium.

2.5

Before I move on to the summary of our implementation efforts, are there any questions on the interim charges or anything?

(No response.)

MS. LOVE: And since the time when I prepared the information for the board briefing book, I did went to note there have been a few more bills that we've moved towards implementation on, so some of the figures are slightly different. But we have identified seventy-one bills that were passed by the 84th Legislature that do have some measurable impact in terms of implementation for the department.

Currently we have ten bills that are on hold for further implementation due to third party prerequisites, and that can include anything from there are specialty license plate bills that were passed that require a deposit by the private entity requesting those plates and those are waiting for those deposits to come in. And then there's also some other efforts related to Senate Bill 20 which was on state contracting. The Department of Information Resources and the Comptroller are still working on some of those implementation efforts and defining the rules that will impact all agencies on that.

We also have now fully implemented twenty-three

bills from the session, and thirty-eight bills are on schedule for full implementation. Seventeen of those thirty-eight have a delayed implementation date of January 1 in the law t allow us time to complete the RTS refactoring project to implement those bills, and we are on target for those implementation efforts. And then twenty-one of those bills are currently in effect but we have pretty much implemented them, there are just minor manual revisions that we're waiting on.

2.5

There are a few bills that will be fully implemented after you take further action later today. Those include a House Bill 763 by Susan King that the people who can petition state agency boards and commissions for rulemaking must be state residents or state businesses. And so there will be rules considered later in Chapter 206 of our Administrative Code that will fully implement that.

We also have rules for your consideration in Chapter 208 later today that will fully implement House Bill 3337 by Representative Clardy which would require the executive director to approve any reimbursements for tuition expenses incurred by state employees.

And in addition, there will be Chapter 210 for your consideration later that adds a segment related to contracting in line with Senate Bill 20, and that will be

up later. And then lastly, there's some rules that are up for proposal for Chapter 217 that implement Senate Bill 449 by Senator Bettencourt which allows for autocycles to be consistent with what's currently in statute and recognized as motorcycles for the purposes of titling.

I wanted to move on to our single sticker continued implementation efforts from the bills passed in the 83rd Legislative Session, but before I do so, did anyone have any questions about the 84th Legislative implementation efforts?

(No response.)

2.5

MS. LOVE: And so we are still in the implementation phase of House Bill 2305 from the 83rd Legislative Session, which has the language related to the Two Steps, One Sticker program. And during this first year of implementation, which will conclude at the end of February in 2016, there is the ability for people, in order to sync up the Texas fleet, people will just need to have a valid inspection prior to moving forward with registration. And then as we move into the second year of the program, starting on March 1, we will start messaging more information to people about their requirement to have that inspection no earlier than 90 days prior to the expiration of their registration.

And so certainly we kind of are in a window

where there could be some confusion. There are people who will go through this process for the first time through February, but yet we want to make sure that those who are looking toward their March renewal process that they are aware of their inspection requirement prior to when they go in for registration renewal.

So we have several efforts underway that we are looking to utilize to help inform the public and our stakeholders about those efforts. We're utilizing stakeholder communication, newsletters and magazines to the extent that we can. Groups such as the Texas Auto Dealers and Texas Independent Auto Dealers associations have magazine publications and we're submitting articles for inclusion in those efforts. We've also reached out to all legislators and staff with information about the program for inclusion in their newsletters to constituents. In fact, the Alice News Journal had an oped about this from Representative Lozano earlier this month, so that was very nice.

In addition, I think you all saw, and Whitney mentioned this earlier, we're trying to move more people to the eReminder system, and part of that effort has included the development of this QR code, and that is currently something that works and I think each of have one. In addition to doing pins, we will have these

standup cards that we are handing out to tax assessorcollectors around the state, and we'll be doing that at
the VGM conference next week where many tax assessorcollectors attend, and hopefully this will help people in
signing up for our eReminder system.

We currently have, I believe, about 1.7 million people signed up for the system, but we have 23 million registered vehicles, so we're hoping to capture more people signing up for the system, and in that eReminder we'll be able to provide information to people about when they're eligible for their inspection requirement as well.

And in addition to these efforts, we're looking at very heavy use of social media to the extent that we can. We have Facebook and Twitter accounts, and at the beginning of each inspection period that will start, ninety days prior to that next registration date, we will put reminders up on Facebook and Twitter. What we do is we have an image of the inspection sticker, say March 2016 and say: Does this look familiar? If so, you can start your inspection process now. And we'll continue to utilize those efforts.

And then we'll also try to use some rather inexpensive geo-targeted efforts through social media.

You can have sponsored Tweets and sponsored Facebook ads and banners that help get the word and message out, and

we'll be utilizing that as well. And then we are also looking at options for other paid advertising, to include possibly billboards or maybe ads prior to movies, so we're looking at those efforts and we'll have more information on that as we get details related to those.

And that concludes my remarks and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Caroline.

MS. LOVE: I did actually request earlier -- I do need to get a camera, though. The Texas Department of Transportation is currently running a social media awareness campaign called "End the Streak" and what it refers to is that since November 7 of 2000, not one day has passed where there has not been a death on Texas roadways. And this is an effort to try to raise awareness of people to be more cautious and cognizant of what they're doing while they're driving. And they have a black board that says "End the Streak" with a hashtag on it which I have given to our chair, and she's going to hold it up and if you would hold on a moment, I will get my camera and we'll take a quick picture which we'll them post to our Facebook page. Thank you.

MS. RYAN: It's for a good cause, especially on Friday the 13th and since we're all driving home. Many of us are driving home.

(Pause for photographs.)

MS. RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

Next we'll move to 5.C. Judy Sandberg, and Eric and Jeremiah -- sorry -- and team, the A-Team.

MS. SANDBERG: Yes. We travel in groups.

MS. RYAN: Safety in numbers.

MS. SANDBERG: Good morning, Madam Chair, members, and Ms. Brewster. For the record, Judy Sandberg, director of TxDMV Enterprise Project Management Office.

I'm joined by my colleagues this morning, Eric Obermier, chief information officer for the agency, and Jeremiah Kuntz, director of VTR.

I am going to provide you a report this morning on enterprise project status. My report is available in your agenda briefing book beginning on page 116. This is primarily a briefing, I will not be requesting any decisions during this briefing, but later in the agenda there is a contract request related to the single sticker phase II project.

Moving on to page 117 in your briefing book, an update on the RTS refactoring project. This project is behind schedule but it is within budget. The project began on August 15, 2013 and is currently to end on December 31, 2018. The overall project budget for that time period is \$72 million.

Achievements to date, the refactored RTS and enterprise reporting system using Cognos are operational now in all 254 counties. Maintenance of the refactored RTS system is now in full swing. This is known contractually as work stream four, and we've actually completed releases one and two for RTS, as well as release one for the enterprise reporting system. Work that is in progress is migration off of the mainframe onto servers in the Data Center Services, or DCS, environment. That is currently scheduled to happen the weekend of November 20 through November 22.

We have started a public information campaign which began on November 6. This is a very comprehensive campaign led primarily by staff in Caroline Love's office, Government and Strategic Communications. They have identified primary stakeholders who need to be aware of the mainframe outage that will occur that weekend of November 20 through 22, and communications have begun to various organizations and entities who need to be aware of this outage. They have included information for the motoring public, counties, deputies, car dealers, toll road authorities, fifty cities related to scofflaw, fellow agencies, including the Governor's Office, DPS, TCEQ, the Comptroller's Office, and several organizations, including TACA, TIADA, and external users of IVTRS and

NVInet. This communication will extend for the next week until we actually go live on November 20.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MR. BARNWELL: What are the chances?

MS. SANDBERG: We think they're good. are some continued risks, in fairness. The greatest risk to us at this moment is the batch processing moving from the mainframe onto the servers. We've made significant progress in all testing areas, including all the interfaces. The primary remaining high risk that we're encountering is one particular batch job that we continue to see challenges with. It does not have to be fully implemented on November 20, but it must be operational by December 11 because it has to do with the new renewals related to single sticker. We have a final go/no-go meeting at the executive steering committee this coming Wednesday where we expect to receive information from the technical team on whether that has been addressed sufficiently to allow us to vote to go. If we do not, we also are working on mitigation strategies and on plans for communication if we do have to postpone this for any reason.

MS. RYAN: The postponement would be for the complete move from the mainframe or just for this particular area, this last batch?

MS. SANDBERG: It would most likely be

postponement for the complete move if it comes to that.

We're hoping to have information -- even though the correction might not be fully implemented by November 20, we want to know before November 20 that we know exactly what needs to be done and what's required and that it can be accomplished before the December 11 date when it must run successfully.

MR. BARNWELL: Or what?

MS. SANDBERG: Or what? We stay on our current environment so that we can run those renewal notices on December 11, but that results in some potential increased costs to the agency if we stay on the mainframe. The longer we stay on the mainframe, that begins to have an impact on cost.

MR. BARNWELL: And it's not just monetary. There's also legislative, let's say, frustration and disappointment that you'll have to wade through, and we sure don't want to do that. So the chances are -- you can't give me a percentage because you have no idea, but you're hopeful.

MS. SANDBERG: We are very hopeful.

MR. BARNWELL: I'll be hopeful with you.

MS. SANDBERG: Okay, good. Yes. We often ask staff in the executive steering committees to weigh in on their percentages. We are right now very optimistic and

wery hopeful. A tremendous amount of progress has been made in the last two weeks in addressing many of the issues that we have found through testing. We've had very aggressive testing and it's good that we've done that because that has allowed us to uncover several issues which needed to be addressed, mostly related to interfaces. The majority of the interface issues have been addressed.

Eric has some information on regression testing, if you're interested in that, and we have had some larger issues with this same batch process and we have narrowed them down to this remaining one major issue that we need to deal with.

MR. BARNWELL: Okay. It looks encouraging.

MR. INGRAM: Can I ask that you try to convert the problem with the batch jobs to car dealer speak where car dealers would understand?

MS. SANDBERG: Do you want to take that one, Eric?

MR. OBERMIER: Sure, yes. For the record, Eric Obermier, CIO for the DMV.

So if I understand your question correctly,
Member Ingram, it's what would the batch process that's
currently having some struggles that needs to run by
December 11, what would that mean to car dealers?

MR. INGRAM: No. I'm sorry. I'm just trying to say for somebody --

MS. SANDBERG: Layman's terms, what does it mean.

MR. OBERMIER: Layman's terms. So basically what it would mean is that if we could not execute that job on schedule, then we would not be able to generate the hard copy renewals that go out to the motoring public via the U.S. mail, so those would be delayed, potentially.

MR. INGRAM: So I get that the renewals have to be done on the 11th, like that's the drop-dead date for you to get the renewals in the mail in time. Right, that's where we're going with that? But the batch job itself, what is it doing. You indicated like there's more than one batch job and so there's one particular batch job, give me more about what is the batch job doing.

MR. OBERMIER: So it has to come through every record that's in our database and determine which ones are going to need to be renewed. There's actually a series of batch jobs that make up this overall effort, and there is one of them that was running very long, and I don't know the exact number but it was more than eighteen hours when they decided, okay, it's obviously not going to be within tolerance, so they ended up killing that job activity to go back and see what would need to be changed for it.

They have identified some potential fixes and some solutions for it -- this is just as of yesterday morning -- so they were going to start trying to put some of those on paper, so to speak, today to see how much progress could be made with that.

MR. INGRAM: Jeremiah, you're just itching.

MR. KUNTZ: I was going to say I'll try and take a shot at this. The batch job process is basically the computer going through and looking at all the records and compiling a list that is needed to be sent to our printer to create the renewal notices, so that's the batch job. We've got many batch jobs that run, and when we say batch jobs, that's just a code that goes through the whole database looking for things. So we've got a nightly batch that runs so when the counties process a title or registration, we take all that work that was done during the day and we move it over into the database to update all the records. That's called a batch job.

So there's lots of those different batch jobs that run that basically just take information and create either a list or update files, but we've got lots and lots of those. So there were numerous batch jobs that had to be refactored over to the new code and then tested to make sure that when they run it's moving the right files, it's doing it at the right time, all those kinds of things.

1 MR. INGRAM: And so we're down to just one of 2 these batch jobs that is causing us a problem? 3 MR. OBERMIER: One that would cause us a 4 serious enough problem that we would consider not actually 5 launching. 6 MR. INGRAM: Got it now. Awesome. Thank you. 7 MS. BREWSTER: And Madam Chair, if I might. 8 Ms. Sandberg's point about a go/no-go, the governance 9 team, the executive steering committee for this project 10 meets weekly and we follow up on all issues, and although 11 we are very confident that we will go live on the 20th, we 12 do headset checks regularly just to make sure that we're 13 all buttoned up ready to go, ready to launch, and that's 14 the meeting that she is referring to. We are confident 15 that we are going to make the 20th, but this is a meeting 16 where we talk about any remaining issues so that we can 17 just make sure we're absolutely sure and ready to go. 18 MS. RYAN: And that committee meets on a weekly 19 basis anyway. Right? 20 MS. BREWSTER: And then there is a subset of 21 that group that meets with our vendor partner almost daily 22 just to ensure that things are moving forward, and that's 23 comprised of the A-Team that you see before you, as well 24 as Shelly Mellott and myself.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. RYAN: And the whole group is an A-Team,

2.5

we're not meaning to diminish anyone. Complete confidence and support in the whole agency leadership team.

(General laughter.)

MR. OBERMIER: If I may, I would like to take a moment to thank all of the project team staff that has been doing all of the hard work over the last year-plus actually, but especially over the last four to six weeks with this date approaching, many of the staff have been working six-plus day work weeks, they've been giving up every Saturday for the last month and this next one will also be included in that, in an effort to make sure these last defects do get checked off the list.

And we know also that when we do go live that there will be some issues that we will find, and as such, we are already making plans such that both the Deloitte staff as well as the TxDMV subject matter experts, that a portion of them are not going to be wait to be woken up for an issue on the first night of batch runs, they're going to be babysitting it every night until we see that we're not getting alerts. So we're going to have rotational staff until everything is running smoothly enough to go back to just a normal operational one shift mode.

MS. RYAN: I would concur and I would thank everyone for that, and Blake will be getting those emails

1	on Sunday morning or Saturday afternoon now, but as the
2	RTS rollout was going on, Johnny and I were getting them,
3	and as you guys were rolling out the counties over the
4	weekends, I know the staff was there to do that. So I
5	would thank everyone for that work that was on that team
6	because I know you all worked hard to get the counties
7	rolled out and make sure everything was done right to get
8	us to the point that we could get off the mainframe. And
9	I know there's a lot more to do, but thank you. So thank
LO	you for recognizing them, and your work too, all of you.
L1	MR. WALKER: Have those large counties come
L2	back and apologized and thanked us?
L3	MS. SANDBERG: I've had some favorable
L 4	feedback.
L5	MS. RYAN: I think they're appreciative of the
L 6	work that got done. Yes.
L7	MR. WALKER: They were really concerned about
L 8	not turning them on until we knew it was going to work.
L 9	MS. RYAN: I think they're appreciative.
20	MS. SANDBERG: Any other questions about the
21	RTS project?
22	MS. RYAN: We've all got our fingers crossed.
23	MS. SANDBERG: Thank you.
24	Moving on to single sticker phase II, which
25	you've already heard a good bit about, phase II is on

schedule and within budget. We started working on this project back on May 12 and need to implement by March 1, meaning we have about 3-1/2 months left to finish this project.

Achievements to date is we have organized and started holding meetings of an interagency executive partner group. This includes our own agency, as well as executives from DPS, TCEQ, representatives from TAC, as well as from the Texas State Inspection Association. We also have an interagency staff project team which meets weekly and TxDMV staff and our project manager participate in that particular meeting.

Requirements have been completed and design is well underway on the renewal notices. We are actually doing the new programming that's necessary to implement that.

Work in progress is planning on the public information campaign, which Caroline shared with you. We are also in the process of printing new mail-out inserts. Later in the meeting we'll be requesting approval on a contact. This is related to TxIRP to get it prepared for single sticker phase II.

The schedule, as I already mentioned, May 12 through March 1. The budget is currently \$2.3 million.

That includes all of the systems that need to be modified,

as well as the public information campaign. The risks to this project is that the schedule may slip due to the RTS refactoring project. Because many of those system changes are being made in RTS, we have some of the same staff trying to work on both efforts simultaneously. We already discussed in detail the risk related to the batch job which has a direct impact on the timely printing of the renewals. And the TxIRP schedule may slip if we have any delays on the external contract that we'll be seeking approval on.

Our mitigation strategy for single sticker has been to add some additional vendor resources as well as some workarounds, particularly in the Motor Carrier Division, that we'll describe later. But at the moment we are on track but we do have some risks which we are striving to mitigate and make sure that we deliver on time.

Are there any questions about single sticker phase II?

(No response.)

2.5

MS. SANDBERG: So moving on to WebDealer, the reason MR. Kuntz has joined me is we have some exciting news to share about WebDealer.

MR. KUNTZ: So early this morning at about nine o'clock we hit our half million approved WebDealer title

1 transaction. The title was processed in Hays County. MS. RYAN: Where's the confetti? 2 3 (General laughter.) 4 MR. KUNTZ: So we actually have a certificate 5 of appreciation. "On November 13, 2015, Hays County 6 approved the 500th title transaction submitted by Nissan 7 of San Marcos through the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles WebDealer application. Congratulations to Nissan 8 9 of San Marcos and Luanne Caraway, Hays County Tax Assessor-Collector, for their exceptional involvement and 10 11 support of the WebDealer application." 12 (Applause.) 13 MR. WALKER: Has this deal been fixed? 14 (General laughter.) 1.5 MS. CARAWAY: It was a shock to me. 16 MR. KUNTZ: Thank you. 17 MS. SANDBERG: Now we'll go to a status update 18 on WebDealer which is on page 19 of your briefing book. Overall, the status is on schedule and within 19 20 The project began September 1, 2012 and is scheduled to end on February 1, 2017 which is just 21 22 fourteen and a half months away. Achievements to date: 23 we have implemented new cars, used cars, document 24 management, commercial fleet buyers and adoption 25 improvements part one. Work that is in progress:

adoption improvements part two are on schedule to be implemented in January, salvage is on track for May 2016, eTags in July 2016, and we've actually already started work on the final three phases, eTitles, centralized payments, and private party.

The budget is \$9.6 million, a combination of internal and external costs. We are still within budget. The risks to this project are the same risks I've mentioned previously: the schedules may slip primarily due to RTS refactoring, single sticker phase II, and the resource constraints which have already been mentioned. Our mitigation strategies are additional services from staff contractors. We have hired two to three staff augmentation contractors to assist the team with work on WebDealer, but we have forecasted that that will keep us within the budget, we will not exceed budget.

Are there any questions about WebDealer?

MR. INGRAM: Just a very high level overview of what is in the adoption improvements two.

MR. KUNTZ: So after we rolled out new car and used car functionality to the counties, we received feedback from numerous counties about different processes, including batching transactions on the county side, so probably the largest thing that is the adoption improvement phase II which would go in January are some

enhancements that would allow the counties to batch title transaction applications by the dealerships so that they can process those, basically put them in a reviewed status to where they've already looked at them and approved them from the paperwork standpoint, and then set them aside waiting on payment to come in, and then once payment is received, approve all of those at one time. So it's an efficiency issue for the counties to be able to get though those transactions in a faster fashion.

It also will help them in dealing with bulk volumes. One of the things that we've heard is it's difficult, especially in the large counties, is when they've got hundreds or thousands of transactions that are coming in, it's difficult to kind of sort through those, batch them together, kind of move them around. So these functionalities will help them with that to streamline their processes.

The phase one adoption improvement was a request that we had received from a couple of counties that have an external inventory control system that they use in their county to control the inventory of license plates and stickers that are issued to dealers, so some dealers actually take an inventory of plates and issue those out to the customers directly. They needed a way to more seamlessly manage that inventory that those

dealerships had, so we actually built a report, basically flat file, that could be sent and uploaded into their inventory system that would allow them to control that inventory in an external system outside of WebDealer, so that was the phase one that went in November. So those were really mainly improvements to help out on the county side.

2.5

There's also a potential improvement that's being looked at on the dealership side to do batch printing of stickers of all the transactions that they've approved, and so that's something else that's being looked at to help the dealers if they've done a hundred transactions, being able to print all the stickers at one time.

MR. INGRAM: I know that some new car stores are carrying an inventory of plates. Is that being done on the used car level at this time too, or is it just new?

MR. KUNTZ: The decision on whether or not a dealership is going to carry an inventory of plates and stickers is purely up to the tax assessor-collector.

MR. INGRAM: I wasn't sure.

MR. KUNTZ: So that is a deputization. You would need to be deputized, have a bond with the county, in order to get the inventory.

MS. SANDBERG: Jeremiah's team did some hard

1	work I providing me some metrics on adoption improvements
2	so I wanted to just share some of those with you at a high
3	level. For dealer title transactions, we've increased
4	from 2.4 percent in December 2014 to 21 percent in
5	September 2015. For new vehicle transactions, an increase
6	of 550 percent between December 2014 and October 2015.
7	For used vehicle transactions, an increase of 400 percent
8	since statewide implementation in March 2015. For DTA
9	dealers, 240 former DTA dealers now use WebDealer, and of
LO	those, 192 use WebDealer only, and so there are thirty-
L1	eight DTAs still to go to adopt WebDealer.
L2	MR. WALKER: So what percent of the state do we
L3	have on WebDealer now?
L 4	MS. SANDBERG: I'm sorry?
L5	MR. WALKER: What percent of the dealers do we
L 6	have on now?
L7	MS. SANDBERG: On WebDealer, I'm not sure what
L8	the percentage is. There are ninety-two counties signed
L 9	up with WebDealer. I can give you some raw numbers if
20	you're interested in that, but I'm not sure what the
21	percentage is.
22	MR. WALKER: That's okay.
23	MS. SANDBERG: Any other questions?
24	Moving on to the LACE project. This project is

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

currently on schedule and within budget. The current

25

schedule is September 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, fourteen months. The budget is just over \$13 million. Our achievements to date: we have awarded the services contract to Deloitte, the independent verification and validation contract to Software Engineering Services; the project team has been established and the kickoff meeting has been held. The work is in progress on gathering requirements which are on track for now to be finished by December 29. We are also in the process of purchasing software licenses that begin to allow us to start looking at our existing data and preparing it or cleansing it to be used with the new replacement system.

2.5

Risks. The project is significantly behind its original schedule due to other priorities and the time to procure. Our mitigation strategy was to obtain your approval for Executive Director Brewster to approve an increased budget and contracts, which have now been awarded. We used the agency project governance process to re-baseline the budget and the schedule. So we are moving forward and there is tremendous activity involving staff from Motor Vehicle Division, IT, other business areas, Enforcement, and of course, the vendors in getting this project moved forward.

Any questions about LACE?

MR. WALKER: I have a question about your

1 overall. And I love your format, Judy. You've done a 2 real nice job here. When you have down here these 3 budgets, like there's on LACE \$13 million, could you also 4 give us how much of it's been expensed, maybe, and how much remaining we have? I think the \$13 million is what 5 6 we budgeted for the entire project? 7 MS. SANDBERG: Right. 8 MR. WALKER: If we could also maybe say this is 9 how much we've used on that budget and what percentage of 10 the project is completed.

MS. SANDBERG: I can certainly do that.

MR. WALKER: Would it be too much?

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SANDBERG: It would not be too much. That would be easy to do, we have that information.

MR. WALKER: I just don't want to require a lot of work but it would be nice to see how much more we have left on some of these.

MS. SANDBERG: We have that information, I'll be happy to share it.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

MS. SANDBERG: Finally, on page 121 is a list of closed projects to date. RTS data purification, CAPPS HR phase I time and leave, temporary permits; single sticker phase I, CAPPS finance, and active directory have been closed so far.

1 Are there any other questions about the 2 enterprise projects? 3 (No response.) 4 MS. SANDBERG: That concludes our briefing. 5 Thank you. 6 MS. RYAN: Thank you. 7 At this time we're going to go into our second executive session. We're going into closed session. 8 9 is now 11:51 a.m. on November 13, 2015. We will go into closed session under Texas Government Code Section 10 11 551.071, Section 551.074, and Section 551.076. For those 12 of you in the audience, I anticipate being in executive 13 session for approximately forty-five minutes at the 14 longest, so if you'd like to grab lunch, please do so. 1.5 MR. WALKER: Are we going to have lunch? 16 (General laughter.) 17 MS. RYAN: Yes, we're going to eat, Johnny. 18 will convene in open session at that time. With that, we 19 are recessed from the public meeting and we will go into 20 executive session. Thank you. MR. DUNCAN: David Duncan, general counsel. 21 22 Several parties are here being careful because 23 their item has not been officially disposed of. Would you like to announce that Audi will not be heard today. 24

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. RYAN: Yes. I'm sorry. I thought you had

2.5

taken care of that.

MR. DUNCAN: I told them, but technically it's still on the agenda because it was published last week.

MS. RYAN: I'm sorry if we've kept you here all morning. My apologies. Audi will not be heard today. It's my understanding that that was settled and it was taken off the agenda. And if we've kept you here all morning because of our technicality, I apologize that we've taken up your time. Thank you so much. I apologize. Thank you for your time.

(Whereupon, at 11:51 a.m., the meeting was recessed, to reconvene this same day, Friday, November 13, 2015, following conclusion of the executive session.)

MS. RYAN: It is approximately 12:59 p.m. on November 13, and the Board of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles is now in open session. I want to make note that no action was taken in closed session.

We are going to pick up with item 4. We're not going to take item 4.A at this time, we're going to skip that item, it will not be taken up on today's agenda. We are going to take item 4.B. Do I have a motion?

MR. PALACIOS: Madam Chairman, I move the board approve an increase to the salary of the executive director, Ms. Brewster, to the full amounts authorized and budgeted in the TxDMV bill pattern in Article 7 of the

1	General Appropriations Act for the 2016-17 biennium, and
2	to authorize the staff to take the necessary actions under
3	the Act to implement the change.
4	MS. RYAN: I have a motion from Member
5	Palacios. Do I have a second?
6	MR. BARNWELL: Second.
7	MS. RYAN: Second from Member Barnwell. Any
8	questions, discussion?
9	(No response.)
10	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
11	(A show of hands.)
12	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously.
13	MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.
14	MS. RYAN: Thank you.
15	MR. WALKER: Are you buying tonight?
16	MS. RYAN: She is.
17	(General laughter.)
18	MS. RYAN: All right. I would like to move to
19	the area of 6 on our agenda, so I'd like to move to 6.A.
20	Could I have a motion on 6.A or any discussion before we
21	have a motion? I'm open to discussion first.
22	MR. INGRAM: Well, I'll go ahead and make a
23	motion to recommend that we elect Raymond Palacios as
24	vice-chair.
25	MR. WALKER: Second.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	MS. RYAN: I have a motion from Member Ingram
2	and I have a second from Member Walker. Any discussion?
3	(No response.)
4	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand,
5	please.
6	(A show of hands.)
7	MS. RYAN: Do I have anyone that's opposed?
8	MR. PALACIOS: Only if you double my
9	compensation.
10	(General laughter.)
11	MS. RYAN: I can't say the motion carries
12	unanimously.
13	MR. WALKER: He raised his hand.
14	MS. RYAN: Did you raise your hand? Okay.
15	Then the motion carries all in favor. Congratulations.
16	MR. PALACIOS: Thank you, Chairman.
17	MS. RYAN: Thank you.
18	MR. WALKER: I have a question.
19	MS. RYAN: Yes, sir.
20	MR. WALKER: Don't we normally elect the vice
21	chairman once a year on an annual basis?
22	MS. RYAN: We do. It's usually in December is
23	what we have done in the past.
24	MR. WALKER: So does this mean that this is for
25	a sixteen-month period?

1	MS. RYAN: We reelect him in December?
2	MR. WALKER: That's my question.
3	MS. RYAN: Well, I think since it's November,
4	we won't hold it again next month.
5	MR. WALKER: I just didn't know the protocol.
6	MS. RYAN: I guess we could have another
7	election next month, but I think what we would do is carry
8	over till next December, so it would be a thirteen-month.
9	MR. WALKER: So your term is thirteen months,
10	not one month.
11	MR. PALACIOS: I'm fine.
12	MS. RYAN: Unless you want us to redo this
13	again in December. We don't have a meeting in December.
14	(General talking and laughter.)
15	MR. DUNCAN: David Duncan, general counsel. I
16	just wanted to point out that that's not in statute or
17	rule anywhere, that's just the convention that the board
18	has developed.
19	MS. RYAN: We have set that up to where we
20	would take that vice chair position on an annual basis to
21	be looked at by the board because that position is an
22	election of the board, and so December of next year we
23	will re-look at that position and take nominations from
24	the board again.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

So thank you, and I think we are losing you.

Is that correct?

2.5

MR. PALACIOS: Yes. Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

MS. RYAN: It is 11:05 and Member Palacios is leaving. Thank you. Safe travels.

And you are representing the contracts, so we are on 6.B.1, Commercial Vehicle Information Systems.

MR. ARCHER: Good afternoon, Chair Ryan, board members, Executive Director Brewster. For the record, my name is Jimmy Archer and I'm the director of the Motor Carrier Division.

I'm seeking board approval to allow Executive Director Brewster to renew and add \$334,000 to the contract with Southwest Research Institute, a contractor that provides specialized services and consulting to the agency with the FMCSA Commercial Vehicle Information System Network, or CVISN, as we call it. This will core CVISN compliance and developing new projects under expanded CVISN.

Texas Department of Motor Vehicles has been using Southwest Research's expertise and services to assist in CVISN projects and responsibilities since January 2012. Southwest Research is also a contractor for TxDOT, performing work on the Texas Intelligent Transportation System. The knowledge attained through Southwest Research Institute's TxDOT work, along with

1 their CVISN expertise, has made them an excellent contractor in assisting with our CVISN system. 2 3 We have funds of \$205,000 set aside from one 4 federal CVISN grant and this is a 50/50 grant with the 5 Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration has awarded half of these funds and the state has matched the other 6 7 half. We'll also be using Motor Carrier Division funds of \$130,000 for monthly operational expenses through August 8 9 2017. This is the first of two two-year renewals of 10 11 the contract. I request that the board give Ms. Brewster 12 the authority to execute the contract. 13 MR. WALKER: Did you say an amount on that? 14 MR. ARCHER: Three hundred and thirty-four 15 thousand dollars. 16 MR. WALKER: I so move that the board give Ms. 17 Brewster the authority to enter into a contract on the 18 Vehicle Information System Network, CVISN annual maintenance contract. 19 20 MR. RUSH: Second. MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Walker 21 22 and a second by Member Swindle. Any discussion? MR. WALKER: It was Marvin. 23 24 MS. RYAN: Marvin, I'm sorry. We have a second 25 by Member Rush. Any discussion?

1 (No response.) 2 MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand. 3 (A show of hands.) 4 MS. RYAN: Motion carries. Thank you. We'll move to item number 2. 5 6 MS. SANDBERG: For the record, Judy Sandberg, 7 director of EPMO. The EPMO and Motor Carrier Division seek board 8 9 approval to issue a statement of work and contract award for vendor services to revise the Texas International 10 11 Registration Plan, TxIRP, system to be in compliance with 12 House Bill 2305 and House Bill 1888, and to enable 13 realtime communication with the inspection database via 14 secure web services. TxIRP is maintained by a third party vendor. All maintenance or enhancements to TxIRP must be 15 16 outsourced to meet the single sticker phase II 17 implementation timeline of March 2016. 18 If approved, the enhancement will provide 19 increased customer service through realtime electronic 20 query of the inspection database, increased efficiency in 21 the verification of inspection and emission compliance, 22 streamlining the process and management of vehicle 23 inspection stickers, reducing cost, and potentially 24 reducing fraud by electronic verification of inspection.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

If denied, the agency will continue the current

2.5

manual process for management of vehicle inspections and will not realize increased efficiency in the verification of inspection and emission compliance. The current volume of work exceeds staff capacity when the manual process is used. This may result in a longer time to process registration requests and the department may be out of compliance with House Bill 2305 for incomplete actions.

2.5

MR. WALKER: You're wanting to enter into a contract or go for a bid?

MS. SANDBERG: We're requesting to release a proprietary statement of work.

MR. WALKER: Just to go out for an RFP?

MR. INGRAM: Madam Chair, I move that the board authorize the executive director, or her designee, to solicit bids and select the best value vendor or vendors for programming services to implement single sticker phase II requirements within the TxIRP system in compliance with House Bills 2305 and 1888. I also move to delegate to the agency's executive director, or her designee, the authority to negotiate, execute and sign appropriate contracts with the selected vendors in consultation with the chairwoman.

MR. SWINDLE: Second.

MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Ingram and a second by Member Swindle. Any discussion?

(No response.)

MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.

(A show of hands.)

MS. RYAN: Motion carries. Thank you.

We will move to item 3.

MR. OBERMIER: Good afternoon, members of the board. For the record, my name is Eric Obermier, CIO for the DMV. The information I'll be covering today can be found on page 124 of your board book.

I'm seeking board approval for TxDMV to solicit and engage technology services vendors to perform various aspects of the ongoing TxDMV-TxDOT technology separation effort. This effort will be managed as a project through the EPMO with oversight of the CIO and the EPMO director.

While TxDMV has made significant progress with technology separation from TxDOT over the last three years, a number of applications and servers remain in the TxDOT domain. Completion of the technology separation from TxDOT requires assistance from a technology services vendor or vendors. TxDMV existing technical and project management staff are already working on multiple high priority projects and initiatives. As part of the separation effort, TxDMV will also migrate applications and servers into the consolidated DCS, or Data Center Services, data centers managed by the Department of

1 Information Resources. 2 Funding for the remaining technology 3 infrastructure separation effort comes from the one dollar 4 automation fee that is included in automobile registration 5 renewal transactions. 6 This concludes my comments and I'll be happy to 7 answer any questions. MR. BARNWELL: Madam Chairman, I move that the 8 9 board authorize the agency's executive director, or her designee, to solicit bids and select the best value vendor 10 11 or vendors for all services necessary to assist with 12 moving applications and databases from TxDOT supported 13 systems to TxDMV supported systems. I also move to 14 delegate to the agency's executive director, or her 1.5 designee, the authority to negotiate, execute and sign 16 appropriate contracts with the selected vendors in 17 consultation with the chairman . 18 MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Barnwell. Do we have a second? 19 20 MR. RUSH: Second. 21 MS. RYAN: We have a second by Member Rush. 22 Any discussion? 23 (No response.) 24 MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand,

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

25

please.

(A show of hands.)

MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank you very much.

We will now move to item 4, amended resolutions.

MR. DUNCAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the board. David Duncan, general counsel.

This one is mine, and I apologize because I made a minor error in a resolution from the last board meeting. At the time Senate Bill 20 had not take effect but when we were revisiting that after the board meeting, when Ms. Flores presented the annual budget to you in the last board meeting, attached to that was a list of contracts, and in the resolution where you acted on the budget and approved the budget, you also approved of those contracts. But the language in Senate Bill 20 says in order for Ms. Brewster to execute those contracts, you have to specifically delegate the authority to sign.

That's the word that's used.

So I'm requesting that you amend that resolution from the last board meeting, and the amendment would say: The board approves delegation to the executive director for negotiation, execution and signature of the contracts listed on page 31 of the fiscal year 2016 operating budget as presented to the board in the August

1	14, 2015 meeting. And I'm available for any questions.
2	MS. RYAN: What did it say previously?
3	MR. DUNCAN: Approved, just the word approved,
4	the board approves of the contracts at that location on
5	that page.
6	MS. RYAN: It didn't say sign.
7	MR. DUNCAN: Sign. Sorry about that.
8	MS. CARAWAY: I'll make a motion. I move that
9	the board amend the resolution entered at the August 14,
10	2015 board meeting which approved the 2016 fiscal year
11	operating budget to state that, "The board approves the
12	budget and attached list of essential agency contracts and
13	approves delegation to the executive director for the
14	negotiation, execution and signature of the contracts
15	listed on page 31 of the fiscal year 2016 operating
16	budget, as presented to the board at the August 14, 2015
17	meeting."
18	MR. WALKER: Second.
19	MS. RYAN: Motion by Member Caraway and a
20	second by Member Walker. Any discussion?
21	(No response.)
	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
22	
22	(A show of hands.)
	(A show of hands.) MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously Thank

MR. DUNCAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. RYAN: We will move to 6.C.

1.5

MR. AVITIA: Madam Chair, board members, Ms. Brewster, good afternoon. For the record, my name is Daniel Avitia. I have the pleasure of serving as the director of the Motor Vehicle Division.

Agenda item 6.C. relates to the continuation of the Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee. I seek the board's approval to continue the Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee. On December 8 of 2011, the existing Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee was created by board resolution. Without approval of a new resolution, the committee will expire on the 8th of next month of this year.

The existing advisory committee, chaired by Board Member Ingram, provided invaluable guidance and recommendations towards the department's efforts to simplify and modernize the process of obtaining a motor vehicle dealer license. The committee's efforts and support significantly, and more importantly, positively impacted the department's customers. Given the good work this committee has done in the past, staff certainly sees value in keeping the committee for future projects. The department continues to need the committee's input in the area of motor vehicle related licensing and regulation

practices.

2.5

At this time, I only ask that the board authorize the continued existence of the Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee. With the board's permission, the selection of new committee members will be considered during a future open meeting. I'm happy to answer any questions the board may have.

MR. WALKER: I have a question. We've created a lot of board committees through the years here, and to my knowledge, we have never put an expiration date on a committee before, so I'm kind of confused at how we put a discontinuation date on this committee.

MR. DUNCAN: You actually didn't. By statute, if any state agency creates an advisory committee, it's subject to a separate statute called the Advisory Committee Act, and it says if you don't specify a date, it dies after four years.

MR. WALKER: After how long?

MR. DUNCAN: Four years.

MR. WALKER: So all committees that we create

die after four years?

MR. DUNCAN: We won't let them because we'll bring them back to you. We'll remind you; that's why we're here.

MR. WALKER: Okay. We've never done this

1	before so I just didn't know.
2	MS. RYAN: This is the first one. Right?
3	MR. DUNCAN: Yes.
4	MR. WALKER: I move that we continue and
5	recreate the License Advisory Committee.
6	MR. TREVIÑO: Second.
7	MS. RYAN: So we have a motion on the floor by
8	Member Walker and a second by Member Treviño. Any
9	discussion?
10	(No response.)
11	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
12	(A show of hands.)
13	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank
14	you.
15	MR. DUNCAN: And Daniel and I will be working
16	with Member Ingram and you, Member Ryan. One manufacturer
17	distributor member has retired and one dealer, and we had
18	spoken to Blake about this already, so we'll be reaching
19	out to you guys for January for possible membership lists,
20	and recall that Whitney actually brings you a suggested
21	membership list, so if anybody has any thoughts, me or
22	Daniel or Whitney will get you guys a list in January.
23	MS. RYAN: Okay. Thank you.
24	Item D, specialty plate design.
25	MR. KUNTZ: Good afternoon, members. Jeremiah

1 Kuntz, director of Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. 2 3 Before you are two license plate designs for 4 your consideration, the Southern Miss license plate and what we are referring to as the Classic Black license 5 6 The plates have met all of our standards. They 7 were posted for eView. This approval is contingent upon 8 the approval of the contract with MyPlates that they pre-9 sell 200 license plates prior to this plate being offered 10 for sale or production. And so we would move your favorable consideration. 11 MR. WALKER: Are we talking about both or 12 13 individually? 14 MR. KUNTZ: At the board's discretion. 15 MR. BARNWELL: Are they both MyPlates plates? 16 They are both plates being offered MR. KUNTZ: 17 by MyPlates. 18 MR. INGRAM: Just to make it simple, I move 19 that we approve the Southern Miss plate. 20 MR. RUSH: Second. 21 MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Ingram 22 and a second by Member Rush to approve the Southern Miss 23 plate. Any discussion? 24 MR. WALKER: They didn't beat the Aggies this 25 year, did they?

1	(General laughter.)
2	MS. RYAN: I'm not aware that they did. I
3	don't even know that they played, although with the year
4	that they're having, maybe it's a good thing, but I don't
5	think so. Any discussion?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
8	(A show of hands.)
9	MS. RYAN: The motion carries unanimously.
L O	Thank you. I needed to double check.
1	MR. INGRAM: I move that we approve the Classic
_2	Black plate as presented.
_3	MR. TREVIÑO: Second.
4	MS. RYAN: We have a motion from Member Ingram
_5	and a second from Member Treviño to approve the Classic
-6	Black plate. Any discussion?
_7	(No response.)
8_	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
_9	(A show of hands.)
20	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously.
21	MR. KUNTZ: Thank you.
22	MS. RYAN: Thank you very much. I guess you
23	key to success is after lunch. Thank you.
24	We will move to item E.1, adoption of rules.
25	David, I guess you're in a good spot.

1 MR. DUNCAN: I am. Again, members, David 2 Duncan, general counsel. This is the adoption of rules that were 3 4 proposed in your last meeting regarding the requirement 5 newly passed in statute in the last legislative session 6 that a person who is submitting a petition for rulemaking 7 is only an interested person if they are a resident of Texas or an entity that's located in Texas, so we're 8 9 making people tell us where they're from if they're going 10 to ask us to make a rule. That's all this is, very 11 simple. Of course, we received no comments, and I'm 12 available for any questions. 13 MR. WALKER: I move that we accept the adopted 14 changes by the staff. 15 MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Walker. 16 MR. BARNWELL: Second. 17 MS. RYAN: A second by Member Barnwell. discussion? You said there was no comment. Correct? 18 That's what I wanted to confirm. 19 20 Any other discussion or questions? 21 (No response.) 22 MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand. 23 (A show of hands.) 24 MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. 25 you.

Item b.

MS. BREWER: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, board members, Ms. Brewster and staff. And welcome Board Members Treviño and Swindle. Glad you're here. My name is Sharon Brewer. I'm director of Human Resources for the agency.

Agenda item 6.E.1.b can be found on page 139 of your board briefing book. And the purpose of this agenda item is to request the board's approval to adopt an amendment to Chapter 208, Employment Practices, Section 208.12 of the Texas Administrative Code. The proposed amendment to this rule will add subsection (d) (4) which establishes that the executive director must authorize tuition reimbursement to an employee prior to reimbursements being made.

The rule amendment is necessary to implement House Bill 3337. Caroline mentioned that bill earlier in her report. This bill amends Government Code 656.048(b), Payment of program expenses. The Government Code was amended effective September 1, 2015.

Our current practice of providing tuition assistance is in compliance with Chapter 656, as amended by House Bill 3337 and the tuition assistance policy can be found in the agency's human resources manual that's available to all employees on our intranet and it is also

posted on our external website which is another requirement of House Bill 3337.

2.5

The policy requires the executive director's approval for tuition reimbursements, that an employee must be full-time continuously employed for one year and maintain satisfactory performance and have no disciplinary actions, courses must be job-related, and the tuition is reimbursed, it is not paid in advance. Employees who participate sign a commitment to remain employed with the agency for six months after reimbursement is received, and courses must be taken from an accredited institution of higher education.

In fiscal year 2015 the agency reimbursed twelve employees for a total of \$24,873.

So the board approved the publication of the proposed rule amendment on August 15, 2015, the proposal was posted for comment on September 4, and the agency did not receive any comments by the 5:00 p.m. deadline on October 5.

The agency requests the board to consider adoption of the amendment to 208.2 by adding subsection (b)(4) which establishes that the executive director must authorize tuition reimbursement to an employee prior to reimbursement being paid.

MR. WALKER: I move that we adopt House Bill

1	3337, as required by statute, for the reimbursement
2	requirements of reimbursement of tuition in our rules.
3	MR. BARNWELL: Second.
4	MS. RYAN: Motion by Member Walker and second
5	by Member Barnwell. Any discussion?
6	MR. INGRAM: So we're adopting the amendment to
7	Section 208.12?
8	MR. WALKER: So the only thing that changed is
9	just the requirement that the executive director approve
10	it prior to sending it for approval. Right?
11	MS. BREWER: That is correct in the rule.
12	That's the amendment to the rule.
13	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
14	(A show of hands.)
15	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank
16	you.
17	Item c. Mr. Harbeson, David Duncan, and
18	Daniel.
19	MR. DUNCAN: Madam Chair, David Duncan, general
20	counsel.
21	MS. RYAN: The other A-Team.
22	MR. DUNCAN: This relates to a significant
23	review of the Chapter 215 rules, Motor Vehicle
24	Distribution, which was worked on extensively by staff and
25	in discussions with industry, and then we had comments on

the rules when we proposed them, and then you and I, Madam Chair, had some discussions yesterday about the possibility of leaving this open for a period after the board's action today. So I just wanted to bring up that we have prepared redline versions of this rule which show the changes that were made by staff after the proposal that would be in support of this adoption, and those changes are corresponded -- I've got an example here if somebody wants to see what it's going to look like, but it's going to be about this thick, and we will provide that for all the board members today for you to review, and if there's no additional concerns raised, if no one sees anything in there where we made a change in response to a comment that strikes your interest, then we would send those for final publication to the Texas Register. It's a little more than two weeks, it's two weeks from next Monday since Thanksqiving is two weeks from today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what I would ask is would you members prefer to get that electronically or a hard copy. If it's hard copy, we can probably get it made before you leave today and give it to you before you leave, or we can have it sent, your choice. It's going to be about most of an inch thick, even two-sided.

MS. RYAN: And to clarify, that same packet of information that you would provide to the board members

would also go to anyone that commented as well. Correct?

MR. DUNCAN: Yes, ma'am, and we would send it to all of them electronically probably this afternoon.

I'm looking at my poor beleaguered staff. But we would get it to the m ASAP, certainly no later than first thing Monday, but hopefully today.

MS. RYAN: And also to clarify, if there was any concerns by the board members and/or anyone that commented, then any action that the board may or may not take today would change.

MR. DUNCAN: It could be stayed, and we would have discussions with you, Madam Chair, about next steps, what we would do next, either schedule perhaps a very short video teleconference meeting in December, or whether to repropose the rules if it's a fundamental issue.

MS. RYAN: And so if I may, just to maybe not be so cryptic, there's a concern that what would normally occur when we look at rules is that we would be able to see the changes in the rules that we would be voting on, and this is a very large -- the changes that were sent out is there were comments sent in to the agency from industry stakeholders that the agency replied back to, but the actual changes to the rules were not submitted to the board or back to the stakeholders, and that was concerning, I think, in discussion. And what we wanted to

be sure of is that instead of just an understanding that maybe there be clarification before the board was able to take action, we would be able to review them, however, based on the timing, the agency might have to start over.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the discussion that we had was that if the board found that we could get comfortable to take action and decided to adopt the rules, there would be a time period that we could review the rules, that he stakeholders could review the rules -- two weeks is what David had said, with a date -- and if there were any concerns with any of the changes that we can now see and read and anyone that posted comment can see and read, they could get back with anyone on with either anyone on the board, because it's not a contested case or anything, or the agency and we could not send it to be posted in the Texas Register which is what makes any action final if we're going to adopt the rules. And in that case, then any changes would have to come back before the board and the board would have to decide to post those changes for additional comments. And that's basically the process that this board and this agency is really proposing.

MR. DUNCAN: And just to be clear from henceforth, regardless of the size of the rule package, at proposal and adoption we're going to give you the whole thing. In the board backup we're going to give you all

four hundred pages or however many it is. At your leisure, you can read it.

MS. RYAN: So instead of being cryptic, that's really kind of, I think, what's before the board to try to make a decision on what we truly are deciding to adopt or not adopt at this point. Otherwise, we will not make our six-month deadline from when we posted the rules, and our other option is to post all the changes again and it comes back to the board and we have a December meeting, or it comes back to the board in January, we post them again, and it goes back out for comment.

So we felt this was a fair and transparent way to have the board take a look at it, the agency and our stakeholders and industries also have a chance to actually see what we were looking at. So that's kind of the thought process.

MR. INGRAM: And I guess, Madam Chair, my question would be are there any stakeholders or industry groups here that have a say one way or the other in terms of this strategy.

MS. RYAN: I'll ask David that.

MR. DUNCAN: I think TADA is the only one that's here that commented on the rule.

MS. RYAN: Again, they'd have the same two weeks.

1	MR. INGRAM: I understand, they'd have the same
2	time frame.
3	MS. RYAN: Well, do you want to ask? Karen?
4	MS. PHILLIPS: (Speaking from audience.) I'm
5	happy with the two weeks.
6	MR. INGRAM: Awesome.
7	MS. RYAN: Okay. Wonderful. All right. Thank
8	you.
9	MR. DUNCAN: Bill will summarize the rest of
10	it.
11	MS. RYAN: Fair enough. I just wanted to make
12	sure everybody understood the process that was being
13	thought about and discussed. We didn't mean to highjack
14	it, Bill or Daniel.
15	MR. HARBESON: My name is Bill Harbeson. I'm
16	the director of the Enforcement Division at the Texas
17	Department of Motor Vehicles.
18	I think the best way for me to accomplish my
19	purpose today, first of all, these rules were first
20	published in June and we received comments from the Texas
21	Automobile Dealers Association, the Texas Independent
22	Automobile Dealers Association, from Gulf States Toyota,
23	and from Buddy Ferguson, a local attorney who represents a
24	number of manufacturers, so they all made comments. And
25	in your package you will see that the general counsel

prepared a very good summary of each of the sections that they made a comment on and what our response was. In many cases we made changes, in some cases we didn't feel changes were necessary.

One of the items that is not in your package that I'd like to just mention is a change to Rule 215.250(j), and this was resolved with staff toward the end of the process and we just didn't have time to get it in. But essentially, what happened was TADA approached us with a problem and that was our general rule provides that when you have a featured price, what I call a grab price, the one that you go see the dealer about, you cannot have any conditions on that so that anybody anywhere could buy that vehicle. So if you had a special discount for financing if you're a previous owner, college graduate, former military, that would all go below the featured price. The featured price everybody gets; any of those additional savings would go below that.

Recently a number of the manufacturers have been offering regionally conditioned pricing. In other words, if you're a Texas resident, Metroplex resident or whatever, you would get a featured price, but following the existing rule, it would throw it down below that featured price. And the suggested resolution to this problem would be to allow only in the geographically

conditioned specials that there would be two prices that the customer would see: one would be everybody gets, the second would be the price that you geographically qualified, provided that it was no larger than the everybody gets it price; and two, it clearly disclosed that this is the Texas resident price.

2.5

And it was believed that this limited change to the prohibition against conditional offers would solve the problem that a lot of the dealers had been talking to me and TADA about. In other words, these Texas dealers would still be able to qualify for these regional or special pricing deals offered by the manufacturer and be able to offer it other than sort of down in this small print below the featured price. But that is not in the discussion provided to you by general counsel's office simply because we worked on this last week and the mailing date had passed.

So other than that, the general counsel's description of what came in and how we handled it is in the board package, and unless you have any questions, I'll turn it over to Daniel. Are there any questions about 215 or any of the changes that have been proposed or how we handled any of the comments?

(No response.)

MR. HARBESON: Thank you.

1	Daniel, do you want to add anything?
2	MR. AVITIA: I think you covered it well, Bill.
3	Thank you.
4	MS. RYAN: Thank you.
5	MS. CARAWAY: Do you want a motion?
6	MS. RYAN: Yes, ma'am.
7	MS. CARAWAY: I'll make a motion. Move that
8	the board adopt the rules as drafted by the staff,
9	contingent on a two-week review of the full redline
10	version of the rule adoption package by the members of the
11	board and any persons who commented on the proposed rules.
12	If after the passage of two weeks, Monday, November 30,
13	no concerns have been raised regarding the adoption
14	package b board members or the previous commenters, the
15	staff may send the rules to the Texas Register for final
16	publication. If any concerns are raised, the staff shall
17	consult with the chairman regarding next steps for
18	additional consideration by the board or reproposal of the
19	rules.
20	MR. INGRAM: Second.
21	MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Caraway
22	and a second by Member Ingram. Any discussion?
23	(No response.)
24	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
25	(A show of hands.)

1 MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank 2 you very much. 3 MR. DUNCAN: And just to clarify, Madam Chair 4 and members, the issue that Bill was discussing, we'll make sure that that's in this package before we send it 5 6 out to you and to the commenters. 7 MS. RYAN: So we should expect that electronic 8 then? 9 MR. DUNCAN: Electronic unless somebody raises 10 their hand and says they want paper. Okay. Electronic, and then anyone 11 MS. RYAN: that commented as well? 12 13 MR. DUNCAN: Yes, ma'am. MS. RYAN: Wonderful. Thank you so much. 14 15 Item d. 16 MR. HARBESON: Yes. My name is Bill Harbeson, 17 and I'm the director of the Enforcement Division. 18 I'm here today asking that the board approve 19 the adoption of the repeal of Section 217, Subchapter I, 20 and the adoption of a new Chapter 221 of our rules under Title 43. These are the salvage rules. The first thing 21 22 I'm asking the board to do is approve the repeal of that 23 section of 217 where they used to be found. We're 24 repealing that section, taking it out and creating a new

25

chapter just for salvage.

The new chapter on salvage is found at 221 and it's summarized by the general counsel's office, it has a number of things. It, first of all, defines certain license types for the first time. It's organized so it's a little easier to follow. Perhaps most significantly, it provides for the first time a notice requirement that when a sale is made of a piece of salvage or a non-repairable motor vehicle that ht purchaser be advised by the seller that it is salvage or a non-repairable motor vehicle. And comments were received on the rules as a whole from the Insurance Auto Auctions, from the Texas Auto Recycles Association, and from the Texas Automobile Dealers

As I said, one of the more significant changes with this notice requirement, and TADA suggested that the rule be slightly amended so that all buyers, including dealers, be advised that what they're buying is salvage or non-repairable, and that the only people exempted from this disclosure requirement would be the Insurance Auto Auctions which staff agrees should be exempt because if you're going into the salvage auction, you know you're buying salvage. So that is the slight change that was suggested last week that staff is asking that you approve that we amend the rule that slight way, along with the other sections that have been published.

1	And again, the comments were very few, mostly
2	dealt with changes in syntax and sentence structure to
3	make them a little easier to read. That was probably the
4	most work I did was one section on flood damaged vehicles.
5	So with that said, are there any questions by
6	any of the board members?
7	MR. WALKER: I move that we adopt the proposed
8	changes.
9	MR. BARNWELL: Second.
10	MS. RYAN: We have a motion by Member Walker
11	and a second by Member Barnwell. Any comments,
12	discussion?
13	(No response.)
14	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
15	(A show of hands.)
16	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank
17	you.
18	MR. HARBESON: Thank you.
19	MS. RYAN: Item e.
20	MR. ARCHER: Madam Chair, board members, again
21	my name is Jimmy Archer, director of the Motor Carrier
22	Division.
23	For the board's consideration I'm requesting
24	that the board adopt amendments to 43 Administrative Code,
25	Chapter 219 relating to Oversize and Overweight Vehicles

and Loads. The proposed amendments were presented to the board at the August 14 board meeting and were published I the *Texas Register* on September 18, 2015.

2.5

Since the executive summary is so detailed, I will point out some of the more notable amendments to this rule. Amendments include changing the definition of the term "non-divisible load" to be consistent with the federal definition. Texas must comply with certain federal size and weight laws and regulations to receive Federal Highway funding. The rule also updates the requirements of providing evidence of a permit to allow a permit holder to provide an electronic copy of certain permits on a wireless communications device, and adds a new annual over-length permit authorized by Senate Bill 662 during the 84th Legislative Session.

As of October 2015, DMV received the following responses regarding the proposed amendments: Texas

Trucking Association provided a letter in support of the proposed amendments and urged adoption. A written comment from Mr. Ray Cernosek with Cernosek Wrecker at Deer Park

Paint and Body stating he didn't see how the overweight and over-length exemptions to Chapter 219 for tow truck hauling vehicles from the scene of an accident or after a breakdown, however, these exemptions are currently included in other statutes, there is no need to repeat the

1 language in this rule. And also we received written 2 requests from TxDOT to modify certain language regarding 3 TxDOT authority for certain permits. DMV agreed to modify 4 the language in response to TxDOT's request. These mostly 5 have to do with routing and restrictions. 6 The proposed amendments create only minimal 7 fiscal implications. If the board votes adoption of this rule, we anticipate it will be published in the Register 8 on or about December 4, 2015 and the effective date will 9 be December 10, 2015. 10 11 I respectfully ask the board to adopt the 12 proposed amendments to Chapter 219 for posting in the 13 Texas Register, and I'll be happy to answer any questions. 14 MS. RYAN: Ouestions? 15 (No response.) 16 I'll be happy to entertain a motion. MS. RYAN: 17 MR. WALKER: I make a motion that we accept the 18 adopted changes to 219 for the Oversize and Overweight 19 changes. 20 MR. RUSH: Second. MS. RYAN: Motion by Member Walker, second by 21 22 Member Rush. Any discussion? 23 MR. WALKER: Ouestion. 24 MS. RYAN: Yes, sir.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. WALKER: Mr. Archer, so after we sign this

2.5

1	today and my truck driver gets pulled over on the side of
2	the road, I can send an electronic copy of his permit to
3	him and DPS is going to accept that, I do not have to have
4	a hard copy in the truck anymore?
5	MR. ARCHER: Of certain permits. The annual
6	envelope will not work because that is on special security
7	paper. Any other kind of permit you would be able to.
8	MR. WALKER: So no more hard copies, just
9	electronic copies work fine.
10	MR. ARCHER: With the exception of the annual
11	envelope permit. And we will provide notice to law
12	enforcement about that.
13	MR. WALKER: I'll send you any tickets that I
14	get.
15	(General laughter.)
16	MS. RYAN: Any other discussion?
17	(No response.)
18	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
19	(A show of hands.)
20	MS. RYAN: Motion carries. Thank you.
21	Item f.
22	MR. ARCHER: You've still got me. Right?
23	MS. RYAN: Yes, sir.
24	MR. ARCHER: Again, for the board's
25	consideration I'm requesting the board adopt amendments to

1 Administrative Code Chapter 217 related to Registration 2 and Reciprocity Agreements. The proposed amendments to 3 section 217.56 are: they adopt by reference any 4 amendments to the International Registration Plan that 5 will become effective on January 1, 2016; to correct 6 language is inconsistent with the International 7 Registration Plan; and a new definition of a personal vehicle so that it's consistent with IRP definition .391; 8 9 changes language listing vehicle types with gross weight of 26,000 pounds or less to be consistent with Section 10 11 1015 of the Texas IRP; and clarifies the title application 12 process by restructuring one sentence. 13 No comments were received regarding the 14 proposed rule during the comment period. Again, if the 15 board votes adoption of this amended rule, it will be 16

published on or about December 4, 2015 and become effective on December 10, 2015.

I respectfully ask the board to adopt the proposed amendments to the Chapter 217.

> MS. RYAN: Any questions?

(No response.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

MR. SWINDLE: Madam Chairman, I move that we approve the proposed adoption for Section 217 as proposed.

MR. TREVIÑO: Second.

MS. RYAN: I have a motion by Member Swindle

1 and a second by Member Treviño. Any discussion? 2 (No response.) MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand. 3 4 (A show of hands.) MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank 5 6 you very much. 7 We will move to item E.2.a, proposal for rules. This would be David Duncan. 8 9 MR. DUNCAN: Members, David Duncan, general counsel, again. 10 11 This is a proposal of a rule that may seem like 12 we're doing belt and suspenders, and to a degree we are. 13 The Advisory Committee Act that I mentioned earlier 14 requires that agencies do rules for each advisory 15 committee that we have. We have traditionally had just a 16 general rule that covered all our advisory committees. 17 What we've decided to do is to break that down by the 18 actual advisory committees and have specific rules for 19 each, and so with this rule we would propose specific rule 20 sections for the Household Goods Rules Advisory Committee 21 and the Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee. So you 22 just reauthorized the Motor Vehicle License Advisory 23 Committee, and now we're going to have a rule that governs 24 its operations.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

They're very simple straightforward rules and

2.5

1 they just deal with the constitution of the committee and 2 the dates that they exist. And I'm available for any 3 questions. 4 MR. WALKER: So the statute that created the 5 Department of Motor Vehicles required that we have 6 advisory committees. 7 It only required one, and that was MR. DUNCAN: the Rules Advisory Committee, and only if somebody 8 9 requested it. MR. WALKER: It said that we had to create 10 11 committees, it said we had to, it's statutorily required. 12 Look at the original bill. And so why would we take and 13 need a rule to govern those committees? 14 MR. DUNCAN: Again, it's that separate statute 15 that says you have to have rules to govern your advisory 16 committees. It's the Advisory Committee Act. 17 MR. WALKER: Where is that rule that says that? 18 MR. DUNCAN: Chapter 2110 of the Government 19 Code. There's a whole chapter of the Government Code that 20 governs advisory committees of state agencies, and it talks about whether you can reimburse the members. 21 22 MR. WALKER: But that is stated in the statute, 23 though, Aline. In the statute it says when the agency was created that we had to create advisory committees and that 24 2.5 the advisory committees would not be compensated per the

Act.

MS. RYAN: Well, I don't know that the statute says that they wouldn't be compensated.

MR. WALKER: I promise, it's in the statute.

MS. AUCOIN: For the record, my name is Aline Aucoin.

Our governing statute did initially state that we had to have one or more advisory committees and it spelled them out. That statute was amended, and it does actually still currently say we have to have at least one advisory committee, which we do. That's our enabling statute in the Transportation Code.

What David Duncan was saying is there's a separate statute in the Government Code, Chapter 2110, I believe the section is 2110.005 says that when an advisory committee is created, the agency shall pass rules that state the purpose of the committee, and that's what these particular rules do, they state the purpose of the committee.

That statute also says that an advisory committee only lasts four years unless you state otherwise by rule. Our rule says that the committee is going to last for four years, but it's a nice record keeping documentation for us that we automatically know how long that committee is going to last and when it's going to

1	end.
2	MR. WALKER: So is this a new rule, or is it
3	just we have not been in compliance?
4	MS. AUCOIN: We have not been in compliance.
5	MS. RYAN: So is it fair to say that by posting
6	these and putting these things in place, we're trying to
7	add additional governance processes to our agency to be
8	more administratively I think we're trying to add more
9	governance to the way we do things?
10	MR. WALKER: Always. That's what government is
11	about.
12	MS. RYAN: No. Governance, not more
13	government.
14	MS. AUCOIN: That's a true statement, and it
15	also puts us in compliance with Government Code Chapter
16	2110.
17	MR. WALKER: So why have we not caught this in
18	the last six years?
19	MS. AUCOIN: I'm sorry. What was the question?
20	MR. WALKER: Why have we not caught this in the
21	last six years?
22	MR. DUNCAN: Busy with other things? I
23	honestly don't know.
24	MR. WALKER: Too many rules.
25	MR. DUNCAN: Actually, Aline told me about it,

it was one of the first things she told me about when I got here, and we decided we would get to it and we did get to it eventually. It's just one of those administrative cleanup things we've been trying to address. We deciding doing a rule review was actually more important than this so we did those first, and I think we're done now.

2.5

MS. RYAN: Is it fair to say it's part of standing up our agency? Right? It's part of us breaking away from TxDOT, and as we continue to mature as an agency, I believe we will find more and more of these things that make us a stand-alone mature agency to where we become and look like an independent agency that we have more and more of these things in place.

I have said often that I am learning that breaking away -- separation of a business from another business is much harder than a merger of a business.

These are the types of things I think we start to find.

MR. WALKER: When we moved over we adopted TxDOT rules, all of them that applied at that time.

MS. RYAN: But you're assuming that everybody looks at things the same way, which is why breaking away from a business is harder than a merger of a business. When you merge a business, you can apply your culture; when you break away, you accept theirs.

MR. WALKER: So David, can you give me a

1 summary kind of real quick of what is required of the formation of committees that's required in this rule? 2 And 3 I know you just did. 4 MR. DUNCAN: This doesn't really relate to the 5 formation. You still do the formation as a stand-alone. 6 That's why we did the Motor Vehicle License Advisory 7 Committee earlier. This is rules governing the committees. This is their operations and their dates of 8 9 existence and those sorts of things, and it's done to comport with our statutes and with 2110 of the Government 10 11 Code. It gets all of those committees in compliance with 12 that. 13 MR. WALKER: So we're not changing any of the 14 statutory -- like for example, it's the chairman's 15 prerogative to create advisory committees. Is that not 16 correct? 17 MR. DUNCAN: Board committees. different. 18 19 MR. WALKER: No. I think the advisory 20 committees go through the chairman also here. MR. DUNCAN: The board shall establish, the 21 22 board shall retain or establish advisory committees. 23 Board committees, like the Legislative Committee that 24 Laura did her appointments, that's delegated to the chair.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. RYAN: Advisory committees are

25

1	shareholders, they're industry issues.
2	MR. WALKER: So you're requesting that we post
3	these rules for proposal.
4	MR. DUNCAN: For proposal. Yes, sir.
5	MR. WALKER: Okay. I make a motion that we
6	post the rule for the administration and oversight of
7	committees.
8	MS. RYAN: Well, they're advisory committee
9	operations specific to two areas. Correct? Specific to
10	Household Goods Rules Advisory Committee and Motor Vehicle
11	License Advisory Committee.
12	MR. DUNCAN: We have three sections. One is
13	advisory committee operations generally and then there's a
14	section for the Household Goods Rules Advisory Committee
15	and the Motor Vehicle License Advisory Committee.
16	MR. WALKER: Those are just the current
17	existing committees, but you're asking for permission to
18	post a rule for all committees created. Right?
19	MR. DUNCAN: That's the first one, and then one
20	for each.
21	MS. RYAN: Two existing.
22	MR. WALKER: Okay.
23	MR. INGRAM: So Johnny, your motion is to
24	publish the amendment to Section 206.93 and propose new
25	sections 206.94 and 206.95 relating to advisory

1	committees?
2	MR. WALKER: I like Mr. Ingram's proposal.
3	I'll drop my proposal and we'll accept his.
4	MR. BARNWELL: I'll second Mr. Ingram's
5	proposal.
6	MS. RYAN: So we have a motion by Mr. Ingram
7	and a second by Mr. Barnwell. Any discussion?
8	(No response.)
9	MS. RYAN: Seeing no discussion, all in favor
10	raise your right hand.
11	(A show of hands.)
12	MS. RYAN: Motion carries. Thank you.
13	Item b.
14	MS. FLORES: Good afternoon. For the record,
15	Linda Flores, CFO for the Texas Department of Motor
16	Vehicles.
17	I'm here to request the board's approval to
18	post a new section in Chapter 210, Contract Management,
19	with a new title: Enhanced Contract Monitoring Program.
20	This can be found on page 331 of your board briefing
21	document.
22	The new section is proposed to implement Senate
23	Bill 20, that Caroline mentioned this morning, to include
24	a procedure for the department to use in identifying

contracts that require enhanced contract or performance

25

1	monitoring. Senate Bill 20 requires each state agency to
2	establish by rule a procedure to identify each contract
3	that requires enhanced contract or performance monitoring
4	and to submit information on the contract to its governing
5	board.
6	I do not anticipate any fiscal implications.
7	The new section would be published in the Texas Register
8	on or before December 4. Comments will be accepted until
9	5:00 p.m. on January 4, 2016. And I'm available to answer
10	any questions.
11	MS. RYAN: Any discussion, questions?
12	MR. INGRAM: I move that we publish the is
13	this a modification or new?
14	MS. FLORES: It's a brand new section.
15	MR. INGRAM: A brand new section. Publish the
16	section 210.3 for comment.
17	MR. RUSH: Second.
18	MS. RYAN: Motion by Member Ingram and second
19	by Member Rush. Any discussion?
20	(No response.)
21	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
22	(A show of hands.)
23	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank
24	you.
25	Move to item c.

1 MR. KUNTZ: Good afternoon, members. For the 2 record, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of Vehicle Titles and 3 Registration. I'll try and move quickly through this as 4 this is our last agenda item. MR. WALKER: Two minutes on that clock back 5 6 there. 7 MR. KUNTZ: Do I need to slow down? Is there an over/under on this one? 8 9 MR. BARNWELL: Johnny is going to have some questions for you. 10 11 (General laughter.) MR. KUNTZ: Before you today are rules for your 12 13 consideration to be posted for public comment. The rules 14 make various changes to Chapter 217.13 of the 15 Administrative Code relating to motor vehicle titles. 16 The rules address three main areas relating to 17 titling of vehicles. The first is relating to adding a 18 new vehicle class known as autocycles. That was a result 19 of Senate Bill 449 that passed during the last legislative 20 session. That is being added to the definition of a 21 motorcycle; those vehicles will be treated just like 22 motorcycles in the titling and registration process. 23 The other change is related to travel trailers. 24 This is to clarify the requirements for length and width

of travel trailers to ensure that there's no confusion

2.5

between statute and our rule on what is allowed to be titled. This creates the envelope of no wider than eight feet wide or anything longer than forty feet is considered a travel trailer.

The last issue that is addressed in these rules is related to assembled vehicles. As we have gone through the process of doing assembled vehicles and applying brands to those vehicle titles as replicas, we have figured out that there's other language that needs to be added to our rules to clarify our processes and procedures relating to those vehicles and how parts may be interchanged between different vehicle classes. This ensures that parts of like vehicles may be interchanged such as the bodies of trucks may be interchanged with one another but you would not be able to mix things such as motorcycles with motor vehicle parts to create a hybrid type vehicle.

So these are just clarifying amendments to the existing rules.

MR. INGRAM: Madam Chair, I move to go ahead and publish the amendment to Texas Administrative Code, Section 217.3 relating to motor vehicle titles for public comment.

MS. RYAN: Motion by Member Ingram. Do we have a second?

1	MR. WALKER: Second.
2	MS. RYAN: We have a second by Member Walker.
3	Any discussion?
4	(No response.)
5	MS. RYAN: Seeing none, all in favor raise your
6	right hand, please.
7	(A show of hands.)
8	MS. RYAN: Motion carries unanimously. Thank
9	you very much.
10	(General talking and laughter.)
11	MS. RYAN: Do I have a motion to adjourn?
12	MS. CARAWAY: So moved.
13	MR. INGRAM: Second.
14	MS. RYAN: All in favor raise your right hand.
15	(A show of hands.)
16	MS. RYAN: Thank you very much for everyone's
17	patience today. Thanks, everybody.
18	(Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m., the meeting was
19	adjourned.)

1

${\color{red} \textbf{C}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{E}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{R}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{T}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{I}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{F}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{I}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{C}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{A}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{T}} \ {\color{blue} \textbf{E}}$

numbers 1 through 181, inclusive, are the true, accurate,

and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording

made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages,

2

3 MEETING OF:

LOCATION:

DATE:

TxDMV Board

Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

4

Austin, Texas

5

November 13, 2015

6

O

7

/

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

212223

/s/ Nancy H. King 11/27/2015 (Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting 3636 Executive Cntr Dr., G22 Austin, Texas 78731